

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9785) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Markler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 9786) granting an increase of pension to William Strang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 9787) granting a pension to Hugh McGinty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9788) for the relief of Eugene K. Stoudenmire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 9789) granting a pension to Theodore A. Melter; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 9790) granting a pension to Elizabeth Rankin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9791) granting a pension to Emma Park; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9792) granting a pension to Mary E. Morrison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9793) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Peake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 9794) for the relief of Wendell Phillips Lodge, No. 365, Knights of Pythias; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 9795) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Mistel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9796) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 9797) granting a pension to Ella Merrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9798) granting a pension to Marinda Maynard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9799) granting an increase of pension to Samuel March; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9800) granting an increase of pension to Amos Carlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9801) for the relief of J. G. Speicher; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Hon. William D. Stephens, governor of California, favoring an increase in pay of commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Public Health Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of St. Louis Young Men's Christian Association, Evangelical Social Center, St. Louis County Welfare Association, Boyle Memorial Center, Shapleigh Hardware Co., the Federation of Jewish Charities, St. Louis Provident Association, St. Louis Children's Aid Society, Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, and Big Brother Organization, all of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of Senate bill 2260 and House bill 2286; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill 3159; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: Petition of John Rooney Post, No. 55, American Legion, of Pender, Nebr., favoring one year's additional pay for soldiers, sailors, and marines who participated in the late war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of C. W. Murhey, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring the enactment of a Federal law that will establish motor-car, motor-truck, bicycle, and motor-cycle thefts as a Federal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petition of sundry citizens of Sharon, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Branch No. 1, New York National Association of United States Civil Service Employees, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an increase in salaries of at least 40 per cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JAMES: Petition of Post No. 17, American Legion, Iron River, Mich., regarding alleged unnecessary wrongs inflicted on members of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of sundry soldiers of Old Central High School, Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the bill authorizing

an extra pay to soldiers in the form of \$30 a month for the period of service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Elma Branch of the Dairymen's League (Inc.), of Elma, N. Y., favoring the amendment to the anti-trust law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the Fess bill, House bill 4438; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Atlas-Imperial Engine Co., of Oakland, Calif.; Royal Packing Co., of Los Angeles, Calif.; and Retail Furniture Association, of California, protesting against the cost-mark bill, which provides for the placing of the cost mark on all merchandise offered for sale; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letter from the Denny Bar Co. and the Alpha Hardware and Supply Co., of Nevada City, Calif., protesting against Senate bill No. 2896; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, October 8, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee in the consciousness of our interdependence, and lift up our hearts to the Father of us all, and ask Thy guidance and blessing. Give us the spirit of sonship that we may know all the qualities of life and character that make, refine, and purify the social and political life of the world. May we follow after God's great thought of the unity of life that is in Christ Jesus. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DEVELOPMENT OF UNUSED LANDS (S. DOC. NO. 124).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report upon the development of the unused lands of the country. The communication only will be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$137,000 required for support of the Mountain Branch, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, at Johnson City, Tenn., for the fiscal year 1920 (S. Doc. No. 122), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$15,000 required by the Office of the Treasurer of the United States for examiners of checks (S. Doc. No. 123), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in order to save the time of the day by having morning business attended to when morning business is called, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pomerene
Bail	Gay	Lodge	Robinson
Bankhead	Gerry	McCormick	Sheppard
Beckham	Gore	McKellar	Sherman
Borah	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Brandeggee	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harding	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Harris	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Harrison	New	Smoot
Colt	Hitchcock	Newberry	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Owen	Underwood
Dillingham	Kenyon	Page	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	King	Phelan	Watson
Fletcher	Kirby	Pittman	Williams
France	La Follette	Polindexter	Wolcott

Mr. PITTMAN. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is absent on important business. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I ask that this notice may stand for the day.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] are engaged in a committee hearing.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained by illness in their families. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on official business.

Mr. GAY. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7478) to amend sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1918.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5218) to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufacturers thereof in the United States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONDITIONS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary read a brief newspaper dispatch from Vladivostok.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

"VLADIVOSTOK POINTS TO DUTY OF ALLIES—COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL DEFENSE WANTS CLEAR EXPLANATION OF POLICY REGARDING RUSSIA.

"OMSK, Thursday, September 25.

"The central committee of national defense in Vladivostok has issued an open letter to the leaders of all political parties in the United States, England, and France, declaring it the duty of the Allies to publish a clear explanation of their policy, showing their opposition to Bolshevism and their sympathy with the movement for the regeneration of Russia. In the letter it is stated, 'in the Far East the American military authorities declared that they considered the Bolshevik band a de facto government of Russia.'

"SUBSTANCE OF THE LETTER.

"The letter declares that the action of the peace conference in inviting the Bolsheviks to the proposed conference at Prinkipo on equal terms with 'the representatives of loyal and patriotic Russia' was a serious blow to the cause of anti-Bolshevism in Russia, and that the peace conference, without listening to the Russian representatives, has approved various separatist tendencies aiming at the dismemberment of Russia. The peace conference, it is declared, treats Russia not as an ally but as a conquered country.

"SAYS CONFIDENCE IS SHAKEN.

"Russia's confidence in her allies, it is added, has been shaken by the above events, by the French abandonment of Odessa 'without any visible cause,' by the interference of the Allies in Russia's internal affairs, by the disintegration of the economic and financial life of the country, and by the humiliation to which the patriotic feelings of Russia are constantly subjected. 'For this reason a clear declaration of policy is considered necessary.'

STATEMENT BY EX-PRESIDENT TAFT.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by ex-President Taft appearing in the Washington Post of this date. Mr. Taft in the statement makes comment upon the speech delivered by Mr. Hoover at Palo Alto, Calif., a few days ago. That speech, I understand, was printed in the RECORD by request of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I think this statement will be of interest to Senators.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT SAYS HOOVER'S PLEA FOR A LEAGUE OF NATIONS DESERVES CONSIDERATION—NO ONE KNOWS MORE OF EUROPEAN SITUATION THAN CALIFORNIAN, AND HIS VIEW OF PERIL INVOLVED IN REJECTION OF PACT IS CONVINCING, FORMER PRESIDENT HOLDS.

[By William Howard Taft.]

"Herbert Hoover is one of the foremost figures of this war. He began as the head of the Belgian relief movement, took charge of our Food Administration, and then became the chief executive of the efforts to relieve the starving peoples of the world after the armistice.

"No one knows more of the actual European situation than he does. He has had to reckon with the political and military and economic situation of every country of Europe in the field of the late war. He has not been in the peace commissions, but he has been where he could and must follow the negotiations and where he was constantly consulted by the participants in the Paris council.

MAN OF WIDE EXPERIENCE.

"Hoover is not an academic idealist. He is a plain, modest man of affairs and wide European business experience. He is a patriotic American who, during the five years of this war, has given all of his time and energy to the cause of the world and to that of his country without compensation in a field new and unworked, but of critical importance in the struggle. He has been a pioneer. He has shown the genius of invention and organization to meet a new emergency.

"From such a man the speech he delivered at his home in Palo Alto, under the eaves of his alma mater, Stanford University, in favor of the treaty and league, deserves the earnest consideration of Americans struggling to reach a just conclusion as to the issues now being discussed in the Senate. Though Mr. Hoover has had no training as a speaker or writer, when he has anything to say he develops a clearness and force of statement and a trenchant style that make it a great satisfaction to read his words.

POINTS OUT PERIL IN EUROPE.

"Mr. Hoover makes clear that we have been foremost in creating a number of independent States in the field of war, whose lives as nations depend on a league of nations of which our country must be a member. If we stay out of it and do not bear our part, and by doing so fail to strengthen the weakening morale of our allies and our infant nations, there is every danger that the condition of Europe will degenerate into that which prevailed in the Thirty Years' War.

"He points out that such a state of things in Europe will, of course, affect us seriously on the material side, and that ultimately we shall be drawn in again. He says that for good or ill we are entangled, and the only question is whether we shall join in this effort, which the league is, to restore law and order in Europe and Asia, or whether we shall hold aloof while chaos and anarchy become worse confounded, and then act with all the additional burden and expense the delay will entail.

"His speech should be printed and sent far and wide as from one who knows, with the hope that it may open the eyes and widen the vision of those who do not seem to realize that we are the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world, and so, whether we will or not, are charged with responsibilities which sooner or later we shall have to meet, and which the quicker we assume the more easily we shall successfully discharge."

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a telegram from U. S. S. Tampa Post, of the American Legion, of Tampa, Fla., which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAMPA, FLA., October 7, 1919.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The U. S. S. Tampa Post, of the American Legion, last night passed resolution indorsing league of nations and treaty without reservations or amendment. We urge you to support these measures.

E. B. PRIEST, Post Commander.

Mr. LODGE. I present resolutions from citizens of Hardinsburg, Ky., and as they are very brief I should be glad if they could be printed in the RECORD without reading, with the signatures attached, as they are few in number.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARDINSBURG, KY., October 4, 1919.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The League to Enforce Peace is flooding this section of the country with "form" telegrams to be sent to the Members of the Senate.

There are in Kentucky 200,000 100 per cent Americans who are without representation in the United States Senate. We therefore appeal to you as the spokesman of Americanism that you do not fail to stand firmly against the league unless it be accepted with the reservations proposed.

We oppose the league in any form, but would be willing for it to be adopted, provided the reservations are made a part of the resolution of adoption.

W. Sherman Ball, county attorney of Breckinridge County; A. T. Beard, county court clerk; P. M. Basham, clerk of the circuit court; J. Raleigh Meador, superintendent of county schools; Herbert Hall, deputy county clerk; J. B. Carman, sheriff Breckinridge County; S. B. Payne, judge Breckinridge County court; D. D. Dowell, cashier Bank of Hardinsburg & Trust Co.; J. M. Crunes, assistant cashier Farmers Bank & Trust Co.; Harry T. Bates, deputy tax commissioner; H. M. Beard, farmer and tobaccoist; Geo. E. Bess, manager Trust Department Bank of Hardinsburg & Trust Co.; Allen R. Kincheloe, attorney; W. A. Meador, sergeant, A. E. F.

THE BULGARIAN TREATY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the Bulgarian treaty which appeared in the London Times of September 20. I will not ask to have it printed as a public document, as it is only a summary, but I have not seen it printed in this country, and I think it may be of interest.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit an inquiry?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether or not in that treaty Thrace was divided and any portion of it given to Bulgaria?

Mr. LODGE. I have not read the summary of the treaty; I have only just received it from the Library. It is a photostat copy of the London Times summary.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Times, Sept. 20, 1919.]

"THE BULGARIAN TREATY—THRACIAN SEABOARD LOST.

"We print below the official summary of the draft treaty of peace handed to the Bulgarian peace delegates in Paris yesterday. It is arranged on the same plan as the draft treaty with Austria, the summary of which was published in the Times of June 3, while the text of the material reserved clauses from the final treaty was published in the Times of September 4. The following parts of the Bulgarian treaty are identical with the draft Austrian treaty:

"Preamble.

"Part I.—Covenant of the league of nations.

"Part VI.—Penalties.

"Part X.—Aerial navigation.

"Part XII.—Labor convention.

"Part II.

"THE FUTURE FRONTIERS OF BULGARIA.

"On the North, the frontier with Rumania remains unchanged.

"On the West, the frontier with the Serb-Croat-Slovene State for the most part follows the line of the old frontier with Serbia. Small portions of territory are ceded to the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, of which the most important is the town of Strumnitza and the surrounding district.

"A modification is introduced into the southern frontier with territories to be subsequently attributed by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers and the new boundary follows a line which may be drawn roughly from a point about eight miles south-west of Bashmakli to Kilkik, passing close to Ardabashi and Daridere, which remain in Bulgarian territory and crossing the Kartal Daghi and the Tokatjik Daghi.

"On the South-East line a slight modification taking in a small piece of Turkish territory north-west of Mustafa Pasha is introduced. The Black Sea forms as before the Eastern frontier.

"Part III.

"POLITICAL CLAUSES.

"Section 1.—Serb-Croat-Slovene State.—Bulgaria recognizes the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and renounces in favour of that State all rights and title over the territories of the Bulgarian Monarchy situated outside the frontiers of Bulgaria, as defined by the present Treaty or by any Treaties concluded for the purpose of completing the present settlement. A Commission, consisting of seven members, five of whom shall be nominated by the principal Allied and Associated Powers, one by the Serb-Croat-

Slovene State, and one by Bulgaria, shall be constituted within 15 days of the coming into force of the present Treaty to trace on the spot the frontier line. Bulgarian nationals who became resident in the territories assigned to the Serb-Croat-Slovene State after January 1, 1910, will require a permit from the Serb-Croat-Slovene State to acquire Serb-Croat-Slovene nationality. All other Bulgarian nationals resident in those territories will acquire Serb-Croat-Slovene nationality *ipso facto* and lose their Bulgarian nationality.

"Section 2.—Greece.—Bulgaria renounces in favour of Greece all rights and titles over the territories of the Bulgarian Monarchy situated outside the frontiers of Bulgaria as laid down in the sections dealing with frontiers and recognized by the present Treaty as forming part of Greece. Bulgarian nationals habitually resident in the territories assigned to Greece in accordance with the present Treaty will obtain Greek nationality *ipso facto* and will lose their Bulgarian nationality. They will, however, be entitled within a period of two years from the coming into force of the present Treaty, if over 18 years of age, to opt for Bulgarian nationality, a similar privilege being accorded to Greeks over 18 years of age who are Bulgarian nationals habitually resident in Bulgaria who may wish to opt for Greek nationality. The proportion and nature of the financial obligations of Bulgaria which Greece will assume on account of the territory placed under her sovereignty will be determined in accordance with the financial clauses of the present Treaty.

"Section 3.—Thrace.—Bulgaria renounces in favour of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all rights and title over the territories in Thrace which used to belong to the Bulgarian Monarchy and which being situated outside the new frontiers of Bulgaria have not at present been assigned to any State. Bulgaria undertakes to accept whatever settlement may be made by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers in regard to these territories and the Principal Allied and Associated Powers undertake, on the other hand, to ensure economic outlets for Bulgaria to the Aegean Sea under the conditions which will be fixed at a later date.

"Section 4.—Protection of Minorities.—The provisions for the protection of minorities reproduce exactly those laid down in the Austrian Treaty, adding the proviso that all persons not nationals of any other State habitually resident in Bulgaria at the date of the coming into force of the present Treaty, as well as all persons born in Bulgaria who are not born nationals of another State, *ipso facto* become Bulgarian nationals.

"Section 5.—General Provisions.—Bulgaria undertakes to recognize all Treaties or agreements which may be entered into by the Allied and Associated Powers with States now existing or coming into existence in future in the whole or part of the former Empire of Russia as it existed on August 1, 1914, and to recognize the frontiers of any such States as determined therein.

"Bulgaria accepts definitely the abrogation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaties and of all Treaties, Conventions, and Agreements entered into by her with the Maximalist Government in Russia.

"The Allied and Associated Powers formally reserve the rights of Russia to obtain from Bulgaria restitution and reparation based on the principles of the present Treaty. Bulgaria undertakes to recognize the Treaties of Peace and additional Conventions which have been or may be concluded by the Allied and Associated Powers with the Powers who fought on the side of Bulgaria.

"Bulgaria declares that she recognizes the Protectorate claimed over Egypt by Great Britain on December 18, 1914, and that she will make no claim on behalf of herself or her nationals to the benefits or immunities derived from the régime of the capitulations in Egypt regarding all Treaties, agreements, arrangements, and contracts concluded by Bulgaria with Egypt as abrogated as from October 11, 1915.

"Bulgaria declares that she recognizes the French Protectorate in Morocco, and that she will make no claim on behalf of herself or her nationals to the benefits or immunities derived from the régime of the capitulations in Morocco regarding all Treaties, agreements, arrangements, and contracts concluded by Bulgaria with Morocco as abrogated as from October 11, 1915.

"Part IV.

"MILITARY, NAVAL, AND AIR CLAUSES.

"MILITARY CLAUSES.

"The military terms fix the total number of effectives of the Bulgarian Army, the sole function of which shall be to maintain internal order and control frontiers, at 20,000, including officers, and it is provided that there will be no other military forces raised outside this figure. This army shall be recruited both as regards officers and men on a voluntary basis; in the

case of officers (who shall not be retired before the age of 40), for not less than 20 years' service, and in the case of non-commissioned officers and men, for not less than 12 years' service. The number of Customs, forestry, or police officials shall be fixed by a military Inter-Allied Commission of Control, and in no case shall the number of these officials who are armed with rifles exceed 10,000, so that the total number of rifles in use in Bulgaria shall not exceed 30,000.

"The proportion of officers, including *personnel*, staffs, and special services, shall not exceed one-twentieth of the total effectives with the colours, and that of non-commissioned officers shall not exceed one-fifteenth of the total effectives with the colours. The effectives of units shall be compulsorily fixed between the maximum and minimum figures laid down in the Treaty.

"On the expiration of three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, there must only exist in Bulgaria one military school for the sole purpose of the recruitment of officers for the authorized units. The number of students admitted to instruction in the school shall be strictly in proportion to the vacancies to be filled in the officer cadres, and both cadres and students shall be reckoned as part of the effectives of the Bulgarian Army.

"Within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the Bulgarian Government shall deposit in places notified by the Allied and Associated Powers any surplus of armament and munitions exceeding the figures fixed per thousand men in the present Treaty, and no other stock, depot, or reserve of munitions shall be formed. The number and calibre of guns constituting the fixed normal armament of fortified places existing at present in Bulgaria shall constitute the maximum amount which may not be exceeded. Within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, the maximum stock of ammunition for these guns will be reduced to and maintained at the rates of 1,500 rounds per gun of the calibre of 105 mm. and under, and 500 rounds per gun of higher calibre.

"No new fortifications shall be constructed in Bulgaria. No poisonous gas or liquid fire shall be manufactured or imported, nor any tanks nor armoured cars, and within three months of the coming into force of the present Treaty, all arms, munitions, and war material of whatever origin or kind existing in Bulgaria in excess of the authorized quantity shall be handed over to the principal Allied and Associated Powers at such point in Bulgarian territory as they may appoint. The Allied and Associated Powers shall also decide on the disposal of such material.

"The manufacture of arms, munitions, and of war material shall only be carried on in one single factory, controlled by and belonging to the State, whose output shall be strictly limited to such manufacture as is sanctioned above.

"NAVAL CLAUSES.

"The naval terms provide that from the date of the coming into force of the Treaty, all Bulgarian warships, including submarines existing or under construction, are finally to be surrendered to the principal Allied and Associated Powers or broken up. Submarines may not be constructed or acquired even for commercial purposes. All naval arms, munitions, and other war material belonging to Bulgaria at the date of the Armistice must be surrendered to the Allies. The Bulgarian wireless station at Sofia will be under Allied supervision and may only be used for commercial messages during the three months after the coming into force of the present Treaty. Nor during the same period may Bulgaria build any more high-power wireless stations.

"AIR CLAUSES.

"The air clauses provide that the armed forces of Bulgaria must not include any military or naval air forces. The entire *personnel* of the air forces in Bulgaria is to be demobilized within two months.

"The aircraft of the Allied and Associated Powers is to enjoy full liberty of passage and landing over and in Bulgarian territory until the complete evacuation of that territory by the Allied and Associated troops. The manufacture of aircraft and parts of aircraft is forbidden for six months. All military and naval aircraft, including dirigible and aeronautical material, are to be delivered on the ratification of the present Treaty.

"SECTION IV. Inter-Allied Commissions of Control.—All Military, Naval, and Air Clauses contained in the present Treaty for the execution of which a time limit is prescribed shall be executed by Bulgaria under the control of Inter-Allied Commissions appointed for this purpose by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers.

"The Inter-Allied Commissions of Control may establish their organizations at Sofia and shall be entitled to proceed as often as they think fit to any point in Bulgarian territory or to send sub-commissions to any such point. The Bulgarian Government must furnish to the Inter-Allied Commissions of Control

all such information and documents as the latter may think necessary to ensure the execution of their mission, and all means (both in *personnel* and material) which said Commissions may need to ensure complete execution of the Military, Naval, or Air Clauses. The Bulgarian Government must also attach a qualified representative to each Inter-Allied Commission of Control with the duty of receiving the communications which the Commission may have to address to the Bulgarian Government and of furnishing it with or procuring all information or documents demanded.

"The upkeep and cost of the Inter-Allied Commissions of Control and the expense involved by their work shall be borne by Bulgaria.

"Part V.

"PRISONERS OF WAR AND GRAVES.

"This section follows the similar one in the Austrian Treaty, except for one article, which, in the case of Bulgaria, provides for an Inter-Allied Commission of Inquiry into offences against the laws of war committed by the Bulgarian Authorities and to search for non-repatriated Allied and Associated nationals.

"Parts VII. and VIII.

"REPARATION AND FINANCIAL CLAUSES.

"Reparation.—The Allied and Associated Governments, while recognizing that the resources of Bulgaria are insufficient to enable adequate reparation to be made, agree to accept from Bulgaria such reparation as she can make, and fix the sum of 2,250,000,000 (two-and-a-quarter milliards) of francs, in gold, which amount (except as hereinafter provided) shall be discharged by a series of half-yearly payments on January 1 and July 1 in each year, beginning on July 1, 1920. The payments on July 1, 1920, and January 1, 1921, shall represent interest at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum on the total sum from January 1, 1920. Thereafter each half-yearly payment shall include payment of interest at 5 per cent. per annum on the amount of the capital sum outstanding, and the provision of a sinking fund sufficient to extinguish the total amount on January 1, 1958.

"The sums shall be remitted through the Inter-Allied Commission referred to in this Treaty to the Reparation Commission created by the Treaty of Peace with Germany on June 28, 1919 (hereinafter referred to as the Reparation Commission), in accordance with the arrangements already made. The Reparation Commission shall have power at any time to dispose, either by sale or otherwise, of gold bonds based on the payments to be made by Bulgaria, the nominal amount of which bonds shall be fixed by it in consultation with the Inter-Allied Commission, but shall in no case exceed the total capital sums then outstanding. In such case Bulgaria undertakes to deliver to the Reparation Commission through the Inter-Allied Commission the necessary bonds in such form, number, and denominations and terms as the Reparation Commission may determine. Bonds so delivered shall be direct obligations of the Bulgarian Government, but all arrangements for the service of the bonds shall be made by the Inter-Allied Commission. The Inter-Allied Commission shall pay all interest, sinking fund, and other charges connected with the bonds out of the half-yearly payments to be made by Bulgaria in accordance with this Treaty. Any surplus shall continue to be paid to the order of the Reparation Commission.

"The Inter-Allied Commission shall have discretion to recommend to the Reparation Commission either the reduction of any particular payment due or a reduction of the total capital sum to be paid by Bulgaria, and the Reparation Commission shall have power by a majority of votes to make any such reduction or postponement up to the extent recommended by the Inter-Allied Commission. Bulgaria, on the other hand, shall have power at any time to make immediate payments in reduction of the total capital sum due over and above the half-yearly payments.

"While Bulgaria recognizes the transfer to the Allied and Associated Powers of any financial claims which her late allies may have against her, particularly those derived from the execution of undertakings entered into during the war, the Allied and Associated Powers agree not to require any payment in respect of those claims which have been taken into account in fixing the amount of the financial reparation to be paid by Bulgaria.

"Bulgaria undertakes to return to Greece, Rumania, and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State respectively all records, archives, and articles of archaeological, historic, or artistic interest which have been taken away from the territories of these countries during the present war, and live stock of the descriptions and in the numbers set out in the Treaty, in restitution for the animals taken away by her during the war from the territories of the countries named. Bulgaria undertakes by way of special compensation for the destruction caused to the coal mines situated on Serbian territory by the Bulgarian armies to deliver to the

Serb-Croat-Slovene State during five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty 50,000 (fifty thousand) tons of coal a year from the output of the State mines at Pernik, provided these deliveries are sanctioned by the Inter-Allied Commission, which will require to be satisfied that such deliveries of coal will not unduly interfere with the economic life of Bulgaria.

"The Inter-Allied Commission above referred to shall be established at Sofia as soon as possible after the coming into force of the present Treaty. It shall consist of three members, to be nominated respectively by the Governments of the British Empire, France, and Italy. Bulgaria shall be represented at the Commission by a Commissioner who shall take part in the sittings whenever invited by the Commission to do so, but shall not have the right to vote.

"In the law relating to the Commission there shall be laid down a list of the taxes and revenues (now existing or hereafter to be created) estimated to be sufficient to produce the sums above referred to. This list shall include all revenues or receipts arising from concessions made or to be made for the working of mines or quarries, or for the carrying on of any works of public utility, or of any monopolies for the manufacture or sale of any articles in Bulgaria. This list may be altered from time to time with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

"In case of default by Bulgaria in the performance of her obligations the Commission shall be entitled to the extent, and for the period it may determine, to assume the full control of and undertake the collection of such taxes and sources of revenue, and to hold and disburse the proceeds thereof, and to apply any net proceeds after meeting the cost of administration and collection to the satisfaction of reparation obligations of Bulgaria, subject to any priorities laid down in this Treaty.

"Financial.—Bulgaria is required to make the following payments in the following order of priority—

- "1. Cost of military occupation.
- "2. The service of such part of the external Ottoman Public Debt as a Commission appointed for the purpose may attribute to Bulgaria.
- "3. The cost of reparation as prescribed by the present Treaty.

"Part IX.

"ECONOMIC CLAUSES.

"The Economic Clauses are virtually identical with those in the Austrian Treaty.

"In the section on property, rights, and interests, a modification has been introduced. The Bulgarian Government is required to revoke all the exceptional war measures affecting the property of Allied nationals, whereas similar measures put into operation by the Allied and Associated Powers are declared final and binding. Bulgaria, in a series of new provisions, is made responsible for certain obligations incurred by her owing to her acquisition of certain property after the Balkan Wars.

"Part XI.

"PORTS, WATERWAYS, AND RAILWAYS.

"The section dealing with Ports, Waterways, and Railways follows almost exactly the lines of the Austrian Treaty.

"Part XIII.

"MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

"This section follows the similar one in the Austrian Treaty, except for a few minor points."

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEERS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four sections from the constitution and statutes of the Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. I do not ask to have any of them read, but they will be found in the book which I send to the desk. The first is found on page 40, section 51; the second on page 53, section 92; the third on page 78, sections 34 and 35; and the fourth on page 93, section 10.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 51. Any member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers who takes the place of anyone engaged in a strike recognized as legal by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers shall be expelled when proven guilty, and shall forever be ineligible for readmittance to this brotherhood.

SEC. 92. All divisions, or members of divisions, are prohibited from issuing circulars or signing any form of petition relative to brotherhood business among members of the brotherhood or others. If issued by a division, its charter shall be suspended, and the length of such suspension shall be at the discretion of the grand chief engineer. If issued or signed by a member, he shall be suspended or expelled: *Provided*, That the foregoing shall not prevent or hinder in any manner any official or division of the brotherhood in properly conducting the business of the organization as to sending out notices, reports, etc., for the purpose of securing or giving information.

SEC. 34. Any member who by verbal or written communication to railroad officials or others, interferes with a grievance that is in the hands of a committee, or at any other time makes any suggestion to any official that may cause discord in any division, shall be expelled as per sections 49 and 54 of statutes when proven guilty: *Provided*, however, That this law shall not apply to a brother in official position when called upon to express an opinion in his official capacity.

SEC. 35. Any member of a general committee of adjustment who wilfully and premeditatedly does, with malicious intent, by act or word in the presence of any railroad official, injure any matter under discussion by said committee which has for its purpose the enforcement of the standing rules of the G. I. D., shall, by a two-thirds vote of said committee, be deprived of serving on the same, the general chairman to fill such vacancy from the membership of the division to which the deposed member belongs, he serving until relieved by one appointed by division so affected.

SEC. 10. Any member or division refusing to sustain the official acts or instructions of the legislative board or who circulates or signs a petition, or who, by verbal or written communication to railroad officials or others, that is calculated to injure or interfere with legislative matters offered by the legislative board, or at any time makes suggestions to railroad officials or to Dominion or provincial legislators that may be detrimental to the interest of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, or who by verbal or written communication to anyone calculated to injure or interfere with national legislative matters offered by our legislative representative at Washington, Canada, or Mexico, or at any time makes suggestions to anyone that may be detrimental to the interests of such legislation, shall be expelled when proven guilty, as per section 49 of statutes.

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from the United States Railroad Administration explaining that they can not move the wheat crop in the West more rapidly than they are now doing because there are no ships adequate to remove it from the ports; that the elevators are therefore congested; and that there is no use of loading the wheat on the cars because they can not get it stored or shipped faster than they are now doing. I ask to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION,
DIRECTOR GENERAL OF RAILROADS,
Washington, October 7, 1919.

MY DEAR SENATOR OWEN: Referring to the telegram from Mr. Whitehurst, of Oklahoma City, and our telephone conversation relative to the wheat situation in Oklahoma and elsewhere:

As I said to you yesterday, all of the ports are full of wheat and we have wheat in cars backed up at each one of them awaiting ships. The movement of wheat from these ports is limited very largely by the foreign vessels available, as the principal receivers, England, France, and Italy, will not use American ships for their wheat on account of the high cost compared with their own. Furthermore, shipping to English ports has been curtailed on account of the strike of railway employees. The Oklahoma wheat moves both to Kansas City and to the Gulf ports. At Galveston and the vicinity thereof the elevators are full and we have 3,000 cars awaiting unloading. We are only able to take 50 cars per day into Galveston from both Texas and Oklahoma. Kansas City elevators are full and a large number of cars are backed up awaiting unloading. We are only able to take into Kansas City 125 cars a day from all points west.

You can see it would be useless for us to continue to furnish cars for wheat when there is no possibility of wheat being taken from the ports in any greater quantities than at the present time. From my investigation I can not find that the rate of exchange has anything to do with the slow movement of wheat. It may have something to do with the slow movement of coarse grain, but that is a small part of our trouble at the present time.

For your information, we have moved about 65,000,000 bushels of wheat from the farms from the 1st of July to date in excess of the movement for the same period last year. For the Southwestern region we have moved from July 1 to date 65,610 cars of grain, which is 16,221 cars in excess of what was moved during the same period last year—an increase of 33.8 per cent. We are giving especial attention to the movement of wheat that is now on the ground in preference to any other.

I am sorry I can not give you greater assurance of relief for shippers in your State. I will be glad to keep you advised from time to time as the situation develops.

Yours, very truly,

J. H. YOUNG.

HON. ROBERT L. OWEN.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

THE PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article embracing a summary of a discussion on the subject of the proposed Federal legislation for the control of the packing industry. It embraces a debate that took place

between Mr. William B. Colver, the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and Prof. L. D. H. Weld, of Swift & Co., representing the American Institute of Meat Packers, before the National Swine Show, which was held at Des Moines, Iowa.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi a question in regard to that article?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. From what publication did the Senator take it; from the Drovers' Journal, of Chicago?

Mr. HARRISON. From the Drovers' Journal, of Chicago.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to its publication in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FARMERS HEAR BOTH SIDES OF PACKER CONTROVERSY—DEBATE BETWEEN TRADE COMMISSIONER COLVER AND PROF. L. D. H. WELD, OF SWIFT & CO., PROVES INTERESTING FEATURE OF DES MOINES SWINE SHOW.

[By L. E. Troeger.]

DES MOINES, IOWA, October 3.

"National Swine Show visitors heard two sides of the packer controversy last night in a debate between William B. Colver, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and Prof. L. D. H. Weld, of Swift & Co., representing the Institute of American Meat Packers.

"W. J. Carmichael, secretary of the National Live Stock Growers' Association, presided and introduced the debaters briefly.

"Both speakers were accorded generous applause. Through a misunderstanding as to the place of debate and its inconvenience the attendance was small. It included leading business men of the city.

"Both speakers used charts and presented their cases in a ready, forceful manner. Mr. Colver opened the debate with a 40-minute argument and closed with a 10-minute rebuttal. Prof. Weld spoke for 30 minutes.

"The subject of the debate was 'Proposed Federal legislation for the control of the packing industry.'

"Chairman Colver discussed it in an indirect way, devoting most of his time to a review of the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of the food industry, which he said centered on the Big Five packers.

WHAT COMMISSION RECOMMENDED.

"He denied that the commission had recommended Government ownership or control of the packing industry. What the commission recommended was:

- "1. Keep the yards open for all buyers of live stock.
- "2. Provide refrigerator-car service for every meat shipper.
- "3. Confine the packers to handling meat. That is a big enough job.

"Chairman Colver complained that it was impossible to get denials into the newspapers when the commission was attacked by the packers, a case in point being the charge that the body had conspired with foreign nations to buy meat lower and hurt live-stock producers.

"He emphatically denied this and challenged any packer to prove it. 'And they can't send a boy,' said he. 'They must come themselves.'

"Prof. Weld said that he regretted his opponent had not stuck to his subject, the Kenyon-Kendrick bills, as he was prepared to show they were unsound and full of danger for the packers and producers.

"Government interference,' said he, 'is sure to make meat prices higher to the consumer and prices of live animals lower.'

"Chairman Colver has said in discussing the packers that it was a good thing sometimes for a business to go through a receivership. It's a good thing sometimes to have typhoid fever, but there's a lot of danger in going through it,' said Prof. Weld, causing a ripple of laughter over the audience.

COLVER CHARGES MONOPOLY.

"Chairman Colver's argument in substance follows:

"We set up the proposition after we had gotten into the investigation pretty well that there is a monopoly in the meat-packing industry.

"It rests on a device for the division of purchases of animals. We found the five big packers united, operating together in many different lines and in the same proportion.

"The proportion of the expenses connected with elections was worked out before the money was spent, sometimes not always the same, but it existed.

"The annual appropriation of \$5,000 to control the editor of the Provisioner was a case in point. Each of the big five contributed a certain proportion.

"It works out on the purchase of live stock, hence there be no competition. It can't be explained as phenomena. There is

a theory that it is plant capacity. But that can only be true if plants are working full capacity all time.

"The five big concerns are buying live stock in 12 markets and we found them in various combinations. Sometimes two, three, another three or two, etc., and they claim the keenest competition.'

CHARTS INTRODUCED.

"Here a chart was introduced showing purchases by the packers. A red saw-tooth line showed fluctuation in prices paid for animals. A black line showing the result when the prices paid by the five at all points ran nearly straight across the chart.

"It is called a coincidence," said Mr. Colver, 'but it's too big to explain that way.'

"Another chart was exhibited showing the relation of hog prices to the prices of pork cuts during August, 1919.

"A red irregular line indicating New York pork prices and a blue line for Boston prices showed a steady advance in prices.

"Another line showed the downward trend of live-hog prices at Chicago.

"Do you see any relation between live hogs and pork prices?' asked the speaker. 'That difference is possible through control of the yards.'

HISTORY OF THE YARDS.

"The history of the stock yards refutes the packers' statement that they can be operated without packer support. The packers have taken over most of the yards after they were developed.

"They permitted private ownership only as long as they could get rebates and bonuses, but when that was forbidden they began the absorption of the yards.

"The only cases where independent packers are doing well is at privately owned yards. They have built up a three-story structure for the Chicago yards to absorb profits. A man don't know when he owns stock; he just has a warrant that he can have stock if he wants it.

"We found the packers running into all kinds of food. The process is: First, get control of meats; second, get control of foods competing with meats.

HOW PACKERS GOT IN BUTTER.

"They found butter competing with oleo, so they got control of butter. It is not the five big packers, but 574 big food firms owned by the packers. Twenty pages are required in our report to give a history of packers' progress. They carry on their business so they absorb the customer, then the man who sells to him. It works forward, sideways, and backward.

"If continued for five years, the five firms will control all we eat. They tell about the little profits on beef and how they are just scrubbing along, but they never say anything about pork profits.

"The Big Five in 1904 had a total worth of \$92,000,000. Up to 1919 they put in \$87,000,000 new capital and \$105,000,000 dividends came out. Their capital now is \$479,000,000.

"They have a great publicity bureau, and you always hear their side. They give out copies of testimony at hearings before the witness goes on the stand. We can't get a fair hearing in the press.'

WELD SHOWS CHART ALSO.

"Prof. Weld offered a chart as his first exhibit, showing the trend of hog prices since June 1, showing the high point on July 21.

"A line showed the trend of pork loins, a very small part of the fresh part of the carcass. It showed a trend generally upward for the period.

"Another line showed the trend of the principal fresh pork products. It was in keeping with hog prices.

"Mr. Colver's chart shows only the trend of pork loins,' declared Prof. Weld, 'a very small part of the fresh cuts.'

"The reason why loins have been high is that the supply of hogs has been light, as usual at this time of the year, and there has been a heavy demand for loins.

"Cured products have declined in price with the live animal. My opponent's diagram is not a fair picture of the hog situation.

"Why have prices of hogs fallen off? Here are the reasons:

"1. Slump in foreign demand and pooling of future orders with the avowed intention of buying on a 12-cent basis.

"2. Agitation on high cost of living.

"In the packers' cellars to-day is the product of 2,600,000 hogs, representing an invoice of \$17,000,000. This invoice value has decreased \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000.

"Can you see where they are making any profit in hogs under present prices?

ANSWERS CHARGES OF MONOPOLY.

"Two charges are made against us:

"(1) We are a monopoly.

"(2) We are getting control of other foods.

"The first charge is based on the percentage of purchases being fairly constant, but which are a natural result of competition and not agreement.

"There is not a single bit of evidence to support this, more than it is a coincidence. The truth is that each packer watches the other so closely that it is impossible for one to gain on the other.

"We keep figures, it is true, showing the percentage of purchases. But they are to keep our buyers in the race. If the percentage at our Omaha house drops, the manager is likely to be called to account. We want and must get our share.

"The percentage figures don't remain quite so constant as you think. Swift's percentages of cattle purchases of the number bought by the big packers increased from 33 to 35 per cent from 1913 to 1918. They all try to increase the percentage.

"We have never used the plant-capacity theory, but I agree it is not a phenomenon. It applies to smaller packers, so they must have an agreement, too. It also applies to other trades where competition is keen.

"The '50-50' reference to the purchases at Denver in a letter cited by the commission meant that Armour wanted to get that per cent if possible. But the commission failed to show that Swift's per cent runs 55 against Armour's 45 per cent.

"They are greatly alarmed because we are extending to other lines. They are fearful of what they call the 1920 model of packing organization, but I say it is just as much more efficient and economical than the old form of business as the 1920 automobile is superior to the old model.

"The attacks on our methods create a scare without basis of fact. They seem to be an obsession on the part of the Government authorities. It is being used to create distrust.

"The handling of other products makes a better outlet for meat products. It is not a menace, but a public service, and it is not fair to say control, as the percentage of food handled is so small."

WHY PACKERS GOT OTHER LINES.

"Prof. Weld then went into an explanation of how and why the packers had gotten into other lines.

"They bought an Illinois coal mine to insure a daily supply of fuel. Swift uses 40 carloads a day at Chicago.

"They went into tanning to prevent being at the mercy of tanneries and to make it unnecessary to tie up capital for so long. They tan only about half the hides they get. About half the hides used in the United States are imported, and the packers do not anywhere near control the supply.

"They must figure close to prevent any more money being tied up than possible, as they pay out \$2,000,000 a day to stockmen at Chicago and do not get any return short of several weeks, and not all for many weeks.

"The packers got into selling other foods to use their big corps of salesmen, their 400 branch houses, refrigerator service, delivery trucks, etc.

"It has made more direct marketing from farm to consumer, and better service all around.

"Swift's only food side lines are butter, eggs, poultry, cheese, and dried fish.

"The commission says the Big Five handle 50 per cent of the supply of these products entering trade channels. The fact is that Swift handles 6 per cent of butter, eggs, and poultry entering trade channels and the Big Five handle about 15 per cent.

THE RICE CONTROL FALLACY.

"Mr. Colver said the retail grocers would disappear in five years. But our control amounts to only about 3 per cent of the grocery business.

"They mentioned in a report that Armour handled 16,000,000 pounds of rice in 1916. That is 1 per cent of the total United States consumption. I could give scores of such misrepresentations of facts and suppression of information."

"Prof. Weld closed his argument with reasons why the K-K bills are objectionable and a menace to the live stock and packing industry, giving those which have been advanced heretofore and which are familiar to readers of the Drovers Journal, and declared the legislation drastic, revolutionary, and setting a precedent for Government control of all business.

"There would be small chance that a man of packing experience would be put over us," said he, "for if there was the country would say the Secretary of Agriculture had sold out to the packers."

COLVER IN REBUTTAL.

"In his rebuttal Mr. Colver declared the big packers were too efficient already, and that one small packer now falls by the wayside through this efficiency every 60 days. He cited the Veeder letter as the most conclusive evidence of an agreement between the Big Five to control the market.

"Against Prof. Weld's example of direct marketing he cited the handling of 800 cans of tomatoes by a Swift subsidiary, Libby, McNeill & Libby, three times.

"There was no more danger in putting a man in control of the packing business than we now have in the relation of the Comptroller of Currency to banks. This power could be under the review of the courts.

"An Omaha packer says the packers are bigger than the Government," said Mr. Colver in conclusion. "We will have the Big Five in control of the Government or the Government in control of the Big Five."

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have read at the desk two telegrams from Los Angeles, Calif.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 7, 1919.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Washington, D. C.:

Our attention called to 2,000-word telegram sent Minority Leader HITCHCOCK by highly financed local branch of the League to Enforce Peace. A complete answer to their propaganda may be found in the fact that Senator JOHNSON addressed two of the most enthusiastic audiences ever gathered in this city, the evening meeting of more than 7,000 persons completely filling the largest hall in the city. As vice president of the meeting, there were present several hundred business men, bankers, judges, lawyers, including three former United States Senators—Cornelius Cole, who was in the Senate during Lincoln's administration; Frank P. Flint; John D. Works; former Gov. Henry T. Gage; and just plain, common people. One result of the meeting was a telegram, signed by men above mentioned and many others, including prominent Democrats, asking Senator PHELAN to join Senator JOHNSON in his valiant fight for Americanism and calling attention to inconsistency of condemning Japanese in California while tolerating them in Shantung. Suggest that Senator PHELAN produce telegram for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Please advise Senate that red-blooded Americans are just as numerous in Los Angeles as they are elsewhere in the United States, and sentiment against the league and treaty is rapidly growing as a result of Senator JOHNSON's visit. JOHNSON has always taken his fights to the common people of California, who are with him now more earnestly than ever before. This organization numbers many returned soldiers among its members, including two majors, as officers thereof. There is no question but that a great majority of the people of this city and the southern portion of California are absolutely behind Senator JOHNSON and his colleagues in the Senate who are trying to preserve our national welfare, honor, and independence.

LEAGUE FOR PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN
INDEPENDENCE, LOS ANGELES BRANCH,
ROBERT M. CLARKE, President.
FRANK S. HUTTON, Secretary.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 7, 1919.

Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Clarke, signing telegram, is former superior judge and Maj. Hutton, secretary, was in charge of draft of State all through the war.

MEYER LISSNER.

Mr. PHELAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I have just read the telegram which was read from the desk during my temporary absence, in which it is stated by gentlemen in Los Angeles that they had sent me a telegram to be inserted in the RECORD and calling attention to the very great success of the meeting at which Senator JOHNSON spoke in that city. The telegram evidently was sent in answer to one that was read into the RECORD by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] the day before, in which it was made to appear that a great many had regretted that their names had been used as vice presidents and had withdrawn their names as indorsing that meeting, thereby indicating their opposition, not so much to the Senator from California as to the opponents of the league of nations.

The gentlemen have seen fit to animadvert upon my position in opposing the presence and immigration of the Japanese into California, while at the same time supporting the provision of the treaty which gives the Province of Shantung in part to the Japanese as against the Chinese. Of course, a Senator's first duty is to his own country; and I desire simply to say that I am opposing by every possible means the introduction of the Japanese into California, as the Chinese are opposing the absorption of their territory by the Japanese. With the Chinese I have a very sincere sympathy, but I am not quite sure how far the United States should commit itself to taking up the cudgels for the Chinese, a nation consisting of 400,000,000 people. I recall the stanzas of Byron:

Hereditary bondsmen! know ye not,
Who would be free, themselves must strike the blow?

And unless the Chinese take the initiative in the expulsion of the Japanese from their territory it is asking a great deal to call upon another nation to do so, in view of the fact that treaty obligations on the part of France and Great Britain with the Japanese seem to give a certain protection to the claim of Japan, of which treaty obligations the United States had no knowledge, however, when it went into the recent conference at Versailles. The league is designed to stop this practice in future. I think it is irrelevant for the gentlemen to bring up in such a manner the Japanese question in California. I am opposed to the Japanese in California, and I am opposed to the Japanese without authority or consent from the people of China taking any part of the territory of China; but as a Senator of the United States I recognize the important fact that treaty obligations give the Japanese some color of title, but voidable and subject to attack. The league will also take cognizance of this. I will be pleased to discuss that question at much greater length, and I intend to do so before the final vote upon this question.

I must say, however, that I have not received the telegram referred to. I have sent to my office, and am advised that it has not yet been received; and I presume, since it appears that only the League to Enforce Peace is properly financed, that these thrifty gentlemen may have sent it by mail, and not by wire. When it is received I will be glad to have it printed in the RECORD, as requested.

After a few moments' pause, Mr. PHELAN said:

Mr. President, I have just heard from my office that the telegram referred to by the gentleman from Los Angeles in the dispatch presented by the Senator from Idaho has not been received; but I have received another telegram of like import from Mr. W. B. Williams and others, and also several telegrams in opposition.

I desire to state that when the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] arrived in Los Angeles for the purpose of making an address, I am informed, he was met by delegates from the Central Labor Council, from the Chamber of Commerce, and from five other civic bodies, asking him to withdraw his opposition to the league, and that evening he made his address. These telegrams were sent subsequently; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD in answer to the one submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
SANTA ANA, CALIF., October 6, 1919.
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge you to join HIRAM JOHNSON in his fight against the Japanese occupation of Shantung and his demands for equal representation with the British in the league of nations.

R. Y. WILLIAMS,	JOHN N. ANDERSON,
W. B. WILLIAMS,	CHAS. D. SWANNER,
A. J. CORREKSHANK,	CLYDE BISHOP,
C. D. BALL,	W. C. JEROME,
J. M. BURLEY,	R. A. CUSHMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 3, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I am pleased to announce that at the regular meeting yesterday of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce the league of nations was unanimously indorsed.

FRANK WIGGINS,
Secretary Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The congregation of the Hollywood Christian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., believing the peace treaty and league of nations to be the only guaranty of permanent peace, earnestly petition our honorable Senate to promptly adopt these without amendments or reservations.

W. F. RICHARDSON, *Pastor.*

CLAREMONT, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congregation, 800, Claremont Church, urge immediate aid Armenia.
M. CHURCHILL, *Clerk.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Emanuel Presbyterian Church, of Los Angeles, third largest in United States, votes 340 to 82 for prompt ratification of treaty and league of nations covenant without amendment or reservations.
HERBERT BOOTH SMITH, *Pastor.*

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

Senator PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Sunday, October 4, at a regular Sunday service of the First Congregational Church of Redwood City, Calif., it was unanimously voted to

request you to do all in your power to compel the Turks to cease their pernicious and atrocious deeds upon the Armenians.

W. A. SCROWELL, *Church Clerk.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate Chamber, Washington:

Grace Congregational Church unanimously begs your powerful support for league of nations. We look to you to put California on side of righteousness and world peace.

S. H. BOWMAN, *Clerk.*

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

By a vote of 10 to 1, Knox Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, at their morning service, October 5, adopted the following: "We believe that the treaty of peace and the covenant for the league of nations should be ratified without reservations or amendments at the earliest possible date."

COMMITTEEMAN KNOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

GARDENA, CALIF., October 5, 1919.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.:

First Methodist Episcopal Church of Gardena congregation assembled October 5, 1919, voted for ratification of league of nations and ask you to indorse same.

PETER ROBERTSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 5, 1919.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Members of First Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Hollywood, Calif., voted unanimous indorsement of immediate ratification of treaty and league of nations covenant without amendments or reservations. They believe the covenant is a notable triumph for American principles and the opposition wholly unwarranted and contrary to public sentiment.

NATHAN NEWBY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to our telegram of September 26 in reference to cold-storage bill, we understand this matter has been taken up by the Interstate Commerce Committee. Senator CUMMINS, chairman, and we request that you voice our opposition to the bills.

DRIED FRUIT ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 5, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: We believe that the treaty of peace and covenant for the league of nations should be ratified without reservations or amendments at the earliest possible date. Official action of our church on ratification Sunday in Los Angeles.

Sincerely, yours,

REV. R. H. JONES, D. D.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
Washington, D. C.:

The Syrian American Association, all of whom are citizens of the United States, unqualifiedly support the President and the league of nations and have passed resolutions to that effect. This association represents 192 intelligent, loyal, and worth-while families in Los Angeles who desire to be placed on record as standing firmly behind the league of nations without enfeebling reservations, and whose earnest desire is that you may lend your strong support to the same end.

P. A. BEHANNESSEY, *President.*
MICHAEL GEORGE, *Secretary.*

SANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF., October 6, 1919.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Current Events Club of Stanford University wish to express its conviction at the high principle underlying the covenant for a league of nations and to uphold you in your stand.

MARGARET D. B. WULLIS, *Secretary.*

SAN FRANCISCO, October 7, 1919.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Lafayette Club of San Francisco, a nonpartisan political organization duly incorporated, comprising a membership of over 2,000 American citizens, in general meeting assembled on the 6th day of October, 1919, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the treaty of peace and the covenant of the league of nations represent the combined wisdom and statesmanship of the greatest nations of the world; and

Whereas we believe that the prompt ratification of said treaty and covenant without amendment by the allied and associated powers would subserve the best interests of all nations and would immediately result in restoring to more normal conditions the affairs and business of the world:

Now, therefore, we respectfully, but urgently request the Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN and the Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, our United States Senators representing the State of California, to use their best endeavors to secure the prompt ratification of said treaty and covenant without amendment.

PETER TREICH, *President.*
JOHN AREES, *Secretary.*

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS—VOTES ON FALL AMENDMENTS.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I understand that in some of the press dispatches it has been stated that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] was absent, but not paired on the votes on the Fall amendments. This statement is incorrect. The Senator from South Dakota was paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], his pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] having been transferred to that Senator. If the Senator from South Dakota had been present, he would have voted against the Fall amendments. He was absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island respecting the attitude of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] upon the Fall amendments, I should like to say that when those amendments were voted upon in the Senate I was absent from the city on account of illness. I had understood before leaving the city that a pair had been arranged and that my position would be announced and thoroughly understood upon any votes taken upon the treaty. Apparently there was some misunderstanding and the pair was not arranged for all votes. If I had been present, I should have voted against each of the Fall amendments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the National Association of United States Civil Service Employees at Navy Yards and Stations, praying for grant of not less than 40 per cent increase in salaries of all clerical employees of the Naval Establishments, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 277, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, of Parsons, Kans., praying for the adoption of the so-called Plumb plan for the operation and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Pleasant Valley Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hackney, Kans., remonstrating against universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 321, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wilton, Me., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior to reclaim swamp and arid lands, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Napoleon Ouellette Post, American Legion, of Rumford, Me., praying for an investigation into alleged unnecessary wrongs inflicted upon officers and soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CUTTING OF TIMBER ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN.

Mr. PITTMAN. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back unanimously, with an amendment to the title, the bill (S. 1) authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operations in another, and I submit a report (No. 256) thereon. The bill has passed the Senate three times in prior sessions. Its purpose is simply to grant corporations organized in other States the same rights in the State of Nevada with regard to timber on the public lands and water rights that domestic corporations have. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of an act entitled "An act authorizing the citizens of Colorado, Nevada, and the Territories to fell and remove timber on the public domain for mining and domestic purposes," approved June 3, 1878, chapter 150, page 88, volume 20, United States Statutes at Large, and section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large, and the several acts amendatory thereof, be, and the same are hereby, extended so that it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits to corporations incorporated under a Federal law of the United States or incorporated under the laws of a State or Territory of the United States, other than the State in which the privilege is requested, said permits to confer the same rights and benefits upon such corporations as are conferred by the aforesaid acts upon corporations incorporated in the State in which the privilege is to be exercised: *Provided,* That all such corporations shall first have complied with the laws of that State so as to entitle them to do business therein; but nothing herein shall operate to enlarge the rights of any railway company to cut timber on the public domain.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the cutting of timber by corporations organized in one State and conducting operations in another."

COLD-STORAGE REGULATIONS.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, a few days ago while I was in the chair—I mention that fact so as to take the responsibility for it—the bill (H. R. 9521) to prevent hoarding and deterioration of, and deception with respect to cold-storage foods, to regulate shipment of cold-storage foods in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. That committee properly has jurisdiction of the subject matter, but the bill was considered in the other House by the Committee on Agriculture, and, in my opinion, it ought to be considered in the Senate by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. For that reason I have been directed by the Committee on Interstate Commerce to ask that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3185) to provide for the establishment of a United States naval coaling station at Southport, N. C. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3186) to provide for an examination and survey of the harbor at Southport, N. C., with a view to increasing the depth of said harbor (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 3187) to dispose of a certain strip of public land in Waterville, Me. (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3188) providing for an increase in salary for the United States district attorney for the western judicial district of Oklahoma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 3190) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pocomoke River, at Pocomoke City, Md.; to the Committee on Commerce.

RENT COMMISSION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill; and I should like to state to the Senate, in a word, just what it proposes.

The so-called rent bill with reference to the District of Columbia went into conference, and after two or three weeks of discussion and some compromises the conference report was agreed to and passed through the Senate. It went out in the House on a point of order, striking out what all the conferees, both of the House and Senate, think was a vital provision that ought to be in the rent bill.

I have taken the conference report, with the exception of the term of the law, which, under the conference report, was to be three years, and made it four years, which it was agreed by all of the conferees, both of the House and Senate, would be preferable to three, and put it in the shape of a bill. I now introduce it, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 3189) to create a rent commission in the District of Columbia was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to have published in the RECORD a petition in the shape of resolutions coming from the committee and chairman, members of the Red Cross and Liberty Loan Workers and Council of Defense Workers of Hollywood, Calif., signed by some of the most prominent people of that section, and very emphatically worded, in favor of an immediate ratification of the treaty without reservations or amendments.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"We favor league. War workers' organization, Hollywood, Calif. Committee and chairman members of the Red Cross and liberty-loan workers and council of defense workers of Hollywood, Calif.

"We are sending to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States an important message. We know our soldiers have laid a foundation for world peace, and the people of the United States want it. With sincerity and firm purpose we have set our faces toward the goal; men and women are in this equal fight urging that the peace treaty containing the covenant of the league of nations be promptly

ratified. The great sacrifice of our soldiers is calling now to us to finish what they began. The loyalty of peace must now inherit the loyalty awakened and offered in war. There must be fruit for the spirit of 8,000,000 men who died for a cause, a better world. They call to us to ring out of this great cause the awful party strife (that will make a black spot in our history) and hasten to ring in the noble modes of life, the love of truth and right, the common love of good to all mankind—the dead ask this of us.

"The undersigned urge that the peace treaty containing the covenant of the league of nations be promptly ratified by the Senate of the United States without attempting to embarrass it by amendments, thus delaying the conclusion of peace and the establishment of a greater agency for its future preservation.

"Mrs. Frances Gwynn Wise, 1811 Tamarind Avenue, Los Angeles; Florence Catherine Kelly, 6007 Yucca Street; Della Noble, 1833 Canyon Drive; Mrs. M. M. Law, 100 Campart Building, Los Angeles; Lota E. Rich, 6026½ Hollywood Boulevard; Mrs. A. W. Pessell, 1850 North Bronson Avenue; Edith T. White, 1807 Tamarind Avenue; Frank B. Wise, 1811 Tamarind Avenue; Dora Woodruff, 1130 West Twentieth Street, Los Angeles; Ella M. Goodrich, 6005 Hollywood Boulevard; Marrion P. Fisher, 5939 Yucca Street; Mrs. Myra Alcorn, 6014 Franklin Avenue; Mrs. Elsie M. Killgore, 1834 North Van Ness Avenue; Mrs. Emma R. Pipes, 6007 Yucca Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Ada E. Shewman, 1811 Tamarind Avenue, Los Angeles; R. E. Briggs, 1345 West Seventeenth Street, Los Angeles.

"These are the names of officials in various war drives. They have been holding community meetings. We have given careful consideration to all objections that you (especially JOHNSON) have offered to ratification, and we are all now convinced that the treaty should be ratified without amendment or reservation.

"We believe in the league, and are ready to work and fight for it as we did to gain the war.

"By a unanimous vote we joined the organization to promote the League to Enforce Peace and the adoption of the league of nations.

"We unanimously voted to ask JOHNSON to reverse his action with regard to the league, and to give it his immediate and hearty support if he ever expects votes in California again.

"(The signers above ask this.)"

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to add to that a request to publish in the RECORD a magnificent article which appeared in the Public Ledger of Philadelphia, signed by Henry Wharton, whom a majority of Senators know by reputation, at any rate, as a very able man and a very original thinker. It admits that the peace treaty is short of perfection, but declares that rejection invites world disaster. I ask that that be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADmits PEACE TREATY IS SHORT OF PERFECTION, BUT DECLARES REJECTION INVITES DISASTER—WRITER TAKES ISSUE WITH THE 18 SIGNERS TO THE OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE PROTESTING AGAINST TREATY AND SAYS THEY WOULD JEOPARDIZE WHOLE WORK OF CONFERENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF PUBLIC LEDGER.

SIR: I have greatly admired the Public Ledger's courageous stand on the league of nations and the peace treaty. It is not always easy to go ahead, even when you are sure you are right, particularly in a hard-and-fast party stronghold like Philadelphia, despite the sound advice of David Crockett. I have also been impressed with your broadmindedness in printing both sides of the question.

In this latter connection I have been struck by a letter which has but recently come to my attention. I refer to the letter published in your issue of September 1 addressed to Members of the United States Senate and signed by 18 men and women whom I take to be Friends (Quakers) and so-called pacifists or conscientious objectors, or both, the letter being transmitted to you by Edward W. Evans in a note dated August 28, 1919.

It is perhaps rather late to recall it, for in the topsy-turvy world of to-day so much happens overnight that one is apt to forget even the sensations of yesterday. But this letter to which I refer, albeit well expressed and evidently most sincere, is not only so contradictory in itself as to be almost paradoxical, but also totally at variance with the previously expressed views

of at least some of this group that one wonders why this has come about—what change has come over the spirit of their dreams. As this applies equally to all of their way of thinking who are now opposing the peace treaty, and as I am still in agreement with them as regards my dislike of and disbelief in militarism, I would like to put to them what seems to me some pertinent questions by way of answer.

In the first place, I would like to ask them why they, of all people, who at one time were accused of being for peace at any price, or, as I believe, were willing to pay a big price for peace, which they then thought essential for the salvation of the world, are now urging others to refuse the peace that is now offered to us because they do not like the price.

Admitted that the terms of the treaty are far from perfect, is it not a fact that these terms have been agreed to by the accredited representatives both of the Allies and Germany? Also, is it not true that they were only agreed to after many months of desperate pulling and hauling and that they are the only ones now before us, so that to refuse them would be to begin all over again, there being no alternative?

And if, as seems evident enough, Mr. Wilson was weakened by the pressure on him by the reactionaries over there, encouraged by the attacks on him by the reactionaries here at home, what do they (the writers of the letter to which I refer and their like) think they will gain by striking hands with those very reactionaries who weakened the hands of the President? For, plainly, the reactionaries on both sides of the Atlantic do not want a league of nations, and as the reactionaries are in control in France and in the ascendancy in Italy and would be in England were it not for Lloyd-George—whatever one thinks of him—to refuse to accept the peace treaty or to return it to Paris with amendments, which would amount to the same thing as refusing it, would in all human probability not only result in a worse treaty from our point of view, but also in the loss of the league of nations as well—or chaos.

The signers of this letter to the Senate not only admit but maintain that the supreme need is for a league of nations in order to bring about "the uprooting of the evil thing which has brought this woe"—"the destruction of militarism and the day of disarmament." As they truly say, "to continue the blood-stained error of the past is to invite for posterity catastrophe far beyond all that we know."

That being so, the present peace treaty is purely secondary to the league of nations and is capable of adjustment when the passions bred by war that still influence the world have subsided.

Then why jeopardize the whole for a part?

If to defeat the league of nations would invite disaster in future—and one has only to look at Fiume to see that even delays are dangerous—then who will be responsible therefor? The framers of the treaty or the reactionaries who either do not want a league of nations or who are willing, for their own selfish ends, to put a spoke in its wheel, plus those well-meaning idealists who insist upon perfection all at once and in their blind haste to attain it would put the cart before the horse, would sacrifice the substance for the shadow?

Finally, why is it that they who, when we would have had a triumphant Germany to treat with, urged the Allies to make peace for the sake of stopping the slaughter, trusting in God and public opinion to regenerate an unrepentant Germany, are not now willing, after the Allies have prevailed, to trust in the same God and public opinion to soften and straighten out the mistakes of the Allies? Most natural mistakes of people who have suffered even unto their very souls from more than four years of desperate struggle with death and destruction, so that they are still not able to see their present path clear, let alone their future!

Can it be that these idealists placed more belief in a war-maddened Germany than they do in their war-stricken friends and Allies who were dealt such foul blows by that same Germany?

It seems to me that the answer is, not that these high-minded idealists have lost their faith, not that they are pro-German, but that they, too, have suffered anguish in their souls from overcontemplation of the horrors of this bloody war, and that once the war was over and the reaction come, in the joy of re-kindled hope, they, following their natural bent, thought that not only the dawn but the day itself had come. So they have come to believe that now is the moment—and now only—and that nothing short of perfection will do.

Not being able to realize fully—who, indeed, can who has not suffered the like?—how impossible it is for men whose homes have been destroyed, the flower of whose youth have been slain in defense of those homes, to reason clearly and dispassionately the very moment the battle is won and retribution within their

grasp; and, judging all others by their own high ideals, they, too, these earnest idealists, have lost their way in the fog of feeling born of war's bitter hates that still envelop the world, and so they can not see the light to come.

For myself I have no doubt whatever about the matter, and firmly believe that not to accept the peace treaty would be the gravest of mistakes. Americans who were in Paris in December, when President Wilson first arrived, and who happened also to return there later on, say in March and April, saw things grow in a very curious way. And to those who could read the multitudinous French newspapers freely, and particularly the so-called "intellectuals," the trend of thought was quite evident. Some of the latter, indeed, were even talking of "1814," etc., meaning thereby the boundaries forced on an unhappy and an unwilling world by that greatest of all disturbers of the peace, Napoleon Bonaparte. But how 18 plus 14 equaled the 14 articles was quite beyond my simple arithmetic.

No; it is not a perfect treaty. How, indeed, under the circumstances, could a perfect treaty have been framed, let alone consummated? But to reject it would invite disaster.

Recommend, if you please, interpret, if you prefer, but do not amend or reserve, for the first means rejection and the second nullification.

HENRY WHARTON.

SAUNDERSTOWN, R. I., September 27, 1919.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there appeared in the Times of Los Angeles, Calif., a magnificent description of the visit of the President to the Pacific coast and of the effect of that visit. It is entitled "The thoughts he left." I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE THOUGHTS HE LEFT."

"The President has come to Los Angeles and gone, leaving behind him thoughts that have compelled thousands to assume a different attitude toward the league of nations.

"No man or woman who heard the President with the determination that they would not be convinced by him is convinced.

"But those who went with open minds, willing to listen and judge, have a new appreciation for the league of nations.

"The President's address in Los Angeles was effective.

"He made the people awaken to the real meaning of the covenant in a manner in which they would not have been awakened had he not have come here.

"In the first place, the President emphasized the fact that the covenant will prevent wars, and that had it been in effect in 1814 the world would have never been dragged through the late holocaust.

"If the covenant would prevent 10 per cent of the wars, the President argued, it would be worth its adoption.

"In his opinion, however, it would prevent 98 per cent of the wars.

"He pointed out how each member of the league bound itself not to enter into war until after nine months of deliberation and attempts at settlement of the matter in dispute, and called attention to the certain conclusion that nine months' enlightened discussion would have prevented the terrible experiences of the world during the past five years.

"He called attention to the fact that during all the years of discussion as to means for preventing wars there has never been any plan evolved excepting a plan for a world league.

"After having explained so clearly what the future of the world would be under a league of nations, one naturally wondered why we would stand willing to sacrifice so great a blessing to mankind for the sake of a few slight objections.

"And then the President took up the objections, and the only objections, as all know, that we have heard anything much about and which are worthy at all of consideration, are the objections that Great Britain should not have six votes in the assembly of the league to one vote of the United States and the objection that the United States should not countenance the Shantung settlement.

"Great Britain's so-called six votes, he pointed out, were only advisory votes, and were worth no more than the one vote of the United States.

"The six votes which Great Britain has are in the assembly of the league, where a representation is given to the six great nations that go to make up Great Britain.

"This assembly is only for the purposes of debate and advice.

"Final action is taken by the council of the league, where Great Britain and the United States each have but one vote.

"He asked if it would be fair to give Cuba and Panama a representation in the assembly and deprive such great nations as Canada and Australia of the right to enter into discussions.

"If the United States were given 48 votes in the assembly, where would it be any better off than with its 1 vote?"

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, in connection with this request, I have not very often asked to have anything printed in the RECORD, but I have here a sermon by Rev. Charles Wadsworth, Jr., D. D., delivered in the Union Chapel, Magnolia, Mass., Sunday, July 13, 1919. I think it will be found very interesting in connection with the subject of the peace treaty, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S IMAGE—A DISCOURSE DELIVERED IN THE UNION CHAPEL, MAGNOLIA, MASS., SUNDAY, JULY 13, 1919, BY CHARLES WADSWORTH, JR., D. D.—A MODERN VIEW OF AN ANCIENT AUTOCRAT.

"Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold." (Daniel 3:1.)

"Nebuchadnezzar was an oriental autocrat, and this image which he set up represented the high-water mark, the culmination of his autocracy. It is difficult for Americans to imagine an autocratic personality. We have been accustomed for so long to constitutional liberty and to the happy conditions of a republican government that the idea of one man attempting to impose his personal opinion upon a nation, to say nothing of the entire world, would be inconceivable. This third chapter of the Book of Daniel brings before us an interesting example of an autocrat, and it is worth our while to study it, as we study extinct monsters like the mastodon and mammoth, which in former ages pranced about upon the earth, but are never seen to-day. Especially in the early part of July is such a study appropriate, when the spirit of Independence Day is still with us, as it will help us to appreciate our blessings and see how far we have advanced beyond the forlorn conditions of a benighted past.

"In the brief study of autocracy which I shall make I would ask you to consider first what the autocrat did; second, why he did it; and third, the results.

"First, What did the autocrat do?

"Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold." He did not consult with his subjects, nor even with the rulers of his kingdom. What were they, that he should consult with them? They were merely inferior beings, who ought to be only too thankful to accept with becoming humility whatever of light or beauty he might condescend to communicate to them. So he resolved in his own superior will and carried out the conclusions of his own exalted mind. He made an image embodying his own ideas of contour and proportion.

"One of his aims was size.

"He made his image three score cubits high. He wanted the biggest. He wanted to put more into it than had ever been put into an image before. We have never seen the image, but we may be sure it was a grotesque conglomeration of incongruities. But as he had evolved it out of his inner consciousness, it represented his ideal and seemed to him perfect and sacrosanct. For anyone to criticize it would have been sacrilege, a sure sign of depravity. To suggest that it could be improved or that it needed amendment would have been both blasphemy and treason, the act of men without vision and without shame. At last perfection had been wrought out, and woe to any reprobates who did not immediately recognize and reverence the revelation thus generously given.

"Nebuchadnezzar made his grotesque image out of gold, the precious metal; and this fact is an illustration of the truth that the finest material can be put to mean uses and twisted into undesirable and ridiculous shapes. It is possible to take a really choice idea or a really noble aspiration, such as the yearning for peace and brotherhood, the very gold of the spirit, and mutilate it into a crazy contrivance. It is possible to play politics with a holy sentiment, such as the hatred of war. The fault lies, not in the material used, not in the idea or aspiration exploited, but in the crude egotism of the autocrat who works precious gold up into a monstrosity. When this deformity, hatched in his own brain, had been wrought out in all its grotesque details by Nebuchadnezzar, he brought it forth from its concealment and forced it upon the people. For those were still the dark days of secret diplomacy, and the world had not yet reached the high enlightenment, where "open covenants are openly arrived at." So this weird image which had been conceived in secret was suddenly set up before a submissive horde.

"To the egotistic mind of the autocrat it seemed the loveliest creation which had ever glorified the low plain of earthly life, something almost too ethereally beautiful for mere mortality. As Minerva was fabled to have sprung full armed in all her dazzling splendor from the head of Jupiter, so this contrivance had sprung from his supernal intelligence complete in its amazing perfection. You remember Kipling's wonderful poem,

'Evarra and his Gods,' in which with the intuition of genius he expounded the psychology of conceited image makers:

"Read here,
This is the story of Evarra—man—
Maker of gods in lands beyond the sea."

"After 'in lands beyond the sea' he had finished his monstrous contrivance, then 'drunk with pride,' he wrote above it:

"Thus gods are made,
And whoso maketh them otherwise shall die."

"That is the attitude and language of all dogmatists and autocrats. They are so obsessed of their own subjectivity, so carried away with admiration for their own weird device, so drunk with pride, that they declare: 'Thus creeds are made, and he who makes them otherwise shall die.' 'Thus ideals, thus Utopias are made, and whoso makes them otherwise shall die.' 'Thus treaties are made, and whoso makes them otherwise, has his eyes on the ground, has no vision, and is anathema.'

"If the aim of Nebuchadnezzar had been to get his image right, what it really ought to have been if humanity was to accept it, he would, of course, have consulted with the wisest men of his country. If he had been seeking sincerely to appropriately embody a worthy ideal, and help the world, he would have invited comment and suggestion, and have submitted his image to the tests of logic and to the canons of art. But his aim was not exalted. It was egoistic. He was interested, not in getting the best for his country, but in forcing upon his country his own handiwork. He was first of all out to assert himself. No one was to touch his idea. He arranged matters so that no change could be made. The image as it came from his infallible hands was to be forced upon his nation.

"To behold the indescribable device, he assembled his vassals upon the plain of Dura. To them, the final beauty, the perfection of wisdom, the climax of leadership, was to be unveiled—not for their consideration or debate, but for their unquestioning and immediate acceptance. So they stood before the image which Nebuchadnezzar had made. 'Then an herald cried aloud:

"To you it is commanded, O peoples, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up. And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.'

"The threat of a burning fiery furnace is the favorite threat of autocrats in all ages. If you do not do what I say, you will be consumed. The demagogic autocrat says, 'If you do not accept my device, I will set the people on you. Do what I say or you will be cast into the burning fiery furnace of war. Do what I say, or you will be cast into the burning fiery furnace of Bolshevism. Accept my contrivance, or you will be cast into the burning fiery furnace of enormous taxes.'

"Americans will wonder at the way Nebuchadnezzar took to force his device upon his people. They will ask why he resorted to ill-natured threats, why he had to be so thoroughly disagreeable. Why could he not have acted like a gentleman, even if he had made a golden image? Why not treat the governors and rulers of his nation as if perchance they had some little intelligence? We must remember, however, that, while for those having any traditions of breeding and independence, such conduct is repulsive, the subjects of Nebuchadnezzar did not mind it. They did not mind being treated like vassals, for that is all they were. To have treated them like rational beings would have been to cast pearls before swine. They had no minds of their own. They were only partisan henchmen, whose lofty rôle was to sneeze whenever their Nebuchadnezzar took snuff; to accept with huzzahs whatever he handed them; to go wherever he pointed; and to applaud frantically whatever he did, no matter how ill-advised, mischievous, crooked, or immoral it was. None of them ventured to think for himself. They waited till the autocrat spoke, then they knew what they were to think. He has decided thus. He has shut to his massive jaw. To question then, to hesitate for a moment then, would be disloyalty. So at his brutal command, these poor vassals vied with each other to see who could first fall upon his face, grovel most abjectly in the dirt, and worship most frantically the golden image.

"Therefore," says the record, 'when all the people heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of music all the people, the nations, and the languages fell down and worshipped the image which Nebuchadnezzar, the King, had set up.'

"It is an edifying spectacle to see them casting themselves posthaste into the dust, accepting with record speed the so-called ideal arrogantly forced upon them.

"Of course, to-day Nebuchadnezzar would not have been able to put anything like that through quite so easily. There would be a redeeming leaven; some would dare the anger of the autocrat and tell him the truth about his image. But in that forlorn and far-distant time which we are studying all the autocrat had to do was to hurl his threat of the burning, fiery furnace and fulminate in ill-tempered arrogance and his subservient henchmen rallied his vassals and hastened to put through any wild plan which he commanded.

"Nebuchadnezzar arranged the program for the performance on the plain of Dura very skillfully and with an eye for dramatic effect. The signal for the universal acceptance and prostration was given by all sorts of musical instruments bursting forth simultaneously. A chorus of sound blared out at a given moment. There were prearranged tootings from all sorts of wind instruments. The cornets of subservient propagandists gave ear-splitting blasts. The flutes of subsidized officeholders poured forth their most seductive lures. The harps of partisans twanged their brazen strings, and the sackbuts of fanatical adherents joined with the psalteries of employees to swell the big noise. An organized effort was turned loose to produce a desired effect. The entire machinery of the government was exploited and converted into a barker for the image. Like a bureau of information it proclaimed, 'This is what the world has been waiting for. This is the latest word, the revelation of the ultimate wisdom. This will heal the world's ills, change human nature, curb passions, and bind all together in brotherhood. This will start the new era and usher in the long-desired Utopia. Former generations did not know of this, because they did not have Nebuchadnezzar. That crowning blessing has been reserved for you. Down on your knees, and with thankful hearts accept the wonderful gift which your great sovereign has been pleased to bring you from the treasure house of his super-soul.'

"So it came to pass that when all heard the big noise they all fell down and worshiped the image.

"I am thankful that I did not live in that age, when subservience was so universal, so thoroughly disciplined, and so easily controlled. We sometimes feel concern for our own time, and are tempted to question its freedom and its sanity. But the leaven of independence is more in evidence to-day than in the day of Daniel. In that degenerate and hypnotized generation no question was raised as to whether the image which they were commanded to accept was right, or true, or beautiful. The only point they emphasized was, Nebuchadnezzar made this, he demands its immediate acceptance; therefore, it must be accepted at once.

"The second question to which our study of this far-distant time brings us is, Why did Nebuchadnezzar do this thing?

"There are two explanations of his conduct, the personal and the political. From the personal point of view it must be regarded as the natural culmination of unbridled egotism. History teaches that human nature can not endure too much power. The human personality becomes unbalanced when it is permitted to exercise too large an authority. It gets power mad. The mortal loses his head and commits excesses. Shakespeare puts it in his matchless diction:

"Man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep."

"This process was working in Nebuchadnezzar. He grew to believe in his own superwisdom, his ability to settle every question. He became convinced that whatever he thought was correct; whatever he desired was right; whatever he resolved upon was what ought to be. To oppose him in anything was the deepest baseness, not to support him in everything was the most vicious treason. This overweening admiration for oneself is a variety of insanity. The German Kaiser had this disease. His brutal people had it also; and many in other countries and generations have had it. It is progressive, and leads to some extravagance. Nebuchadnezzar's making of this image, and his demand that the whole world accept it, was the climax of his mania for power. No longer content with domineering over the external activities of his subjects, he was seized with an irresistible yearning to control also the internal realm of their individuality; to prescribe their ideas for them; as we would say, to tell them how to vote. All his achievements in autocracy up to this point, prodigious though they were, seemed as nothing to his increasing thirst for power, so long as this

inner realm of individuality, this inward kingdom of ideals, remained uncontrolled by his supermind. Above him seemed his realm alone, and 'thitherward he bent his eagle eye.' He took the last step in autocracy, and essayed to construct for mankind the ideal which they must receive and serve. In the natural development of power insanity he set up his golden image on the plain of Dura, and commanded men to fall down before it. In which conduct we can see how far the sinister disease had progressed in his personality.

"The other explanation of his conduct is the political. Of course, this image was contrived for some political purpose, nor is that purpose obscure or far to seek. Nebuchadnezzar's great desire was to unify the race. Mankind was, as Daniel tells us, split up into peoples, nations, languages. Each had its own god or gods, which represented its point of view, its ideal; preserved its individuality; and kept it from merging with other nationalities. Nebuchadnezzar was interested in world unity. He was tired of being autocrat of merely one nation. He chafed under the limitations imposed upon him by these separations. He wanted to get rid of the dividing lines. He aimed at internationalism, to fuse all peoples in one cosmic community, so that he might be the superman over a unified humanity. It is a vision that has fascinated many; an ambition that has taken some captive—not the large unselfish natures like Washington, but the smaller, egotistic beings, the Caesars, the Alexanders, the Napoleons, the Nebuchadnezzars. Having this desire in his soul, Nebuchadnezzar set out to attain it with the practical sagacity that characterized him as a political leader. He knew human nature. He knew that custom and tradition, religion, kept nations separate and individual. He was convinced that if he could only get all peoples, nations, and languages to accept the same ideal, to worship the same deity, the barriers between them would disappear and they could all be fused into one family. Worship of a common object would make them one. So, with characteristic modesty, he undertook to construct the deity for all mankind, the ideal which the entire race should accept and serve. That was what his golden image was intended to be. That was the purpose it was intended to serve. It was to be the means of bringing all men into the new unity, the tie which should bind them together in internationalism or supernaturalism. When at the sound of the cornets, flutes, harps, and all kinds of music the peoples, nations, and languages fell down and worshiped the golden image which he had set up, he expected old separations of customs, ideas, individuality to be wiped out, and that the acceptance of his device would create the international unity which would be the throne of his supremest power and the pedestal of his most enduring fame. He was so eager to accomplish this that he strained his authority to the uttermost to put it through. He organized his government into a propaganda bureau to praise his image. The tootings of the official orchestra deafened the crowds on the plain of Dura. If any did not understand that Nebuchadnezzar's image was heaven-born, they were both perverse and stupid. No suggestion of change was permitted. With haughty command and arrogant threat he pushed his device along and, by the most approved steam-roller methods, stampeded the mob into immediate acceptance.

"In the brief study which we are making of autocracy as embodied in its Biblical example, we have seen what Nebuchadnezzar did, and also considered why he did it, examining the personal and political motives which actuated him. In closing I would ask you to note the results of his effort. These results would fall into two classes, the immediate and ephemeral and the ultimate and permanent.

"The immediate result was undoubtedly success. He put his scheme through. He forced men to accept his device. His ideal in all its grotesque absurdity was swallowed whole. All peoples, nations, and languages fell down on the plain of Dura and worshiped the image which he had made. He became the autocrat of the inner realm of man's thoughts and the superlord over an international conglomeration of peoples.

"But while the immediate result was thus a conspicuous success, the ultimate result was one of the most complete failures of history. Where is Nebuchadnezzar's image to-day? It is one of the things that the world has been only too glad to get rid of and forget. An image that is the real expression of a genuine ideal, like the statue of the Venus of Milo, is cherished even in its mutilation as one of the priceless treasures of mankind. It does not need organized propaganda or autocratic commands or savage threats to push it along. It commends itself to the ages by the symmetry of its ineffable beauty and it makes its way from generation to generation by the white light of its dazzling perfection. An image that requires the tootings of an official claque to launch it and has to be backed up by the threats of burning fiery furnaces is a self-

confessed farce. It troubled the world for a brief period, and then, when the acid tests of time had demonstrated its worthlessness, a long-suffering race buried it in oblivion with a sigh of relief. It did not accomplish any of the things it was intended to achieve. It did not make all peoples one. It did not wipe out the separations of nationality or individuality. It did not change nature or human nature. The compulsory acceptance upon the plain of Dura was only a perfunctory make-believe. When they got up from their knees and their pretended worship of the hybrid image the peoples, nations, and languages were exactly the same they had been before the hypocritical performance. Each retained its own customs, its own point of view, its own interests, its own ambitions. Each continued to revolve in its own orbit, unaltered by the pretended acceptance of the autocrat's device.

"The sum total of result was a great splurge for Nebuchadnezzar. It gave him an opportunity to strut in the lime light. But there was no benefit to anyone else, no benediction to the race, and certainly no blessing to his own nation.

"There were three persons, and only three, who played a creditable part in that far-off drama. Nebuchadnezzar played the part of a power-loving autocrat. The crowd showed themselves to be a brainless, cowardly, hypnotized mob. Against this background of second-rate humanity Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego stand out as real men, heroes and philanthropists, the redeeming features of a dreary landscape. They scorned the command of the autocrat and defied his threat, saying, 'We will not worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'

"The immortal service which they rendered to humanity that day was this, they championed independence against external dictation.

"That is the great treasure of humanity, independence, the independence of individuality and the independence of nationality.

"The treasure of humanity is not the golden images which visionaries and autocrats devise. History is full of image makers, egoists who work their own vagaries up into erratic contrivances which they have the effrontery to call 'ideals' and which they proclaim as the panaceas for the race, the keys to peace, the doors to the millennium. The world has been a vast plain of Dura, on which image after image has been set up, sometimes by autocrats drunk with pride, sometimes by ambitious demagogues, sometimes by unbalanced visionaries. The plain of Dura has heard a deal of foolish shouting through the centuries, as feeble-minded crowds have acclaimed now one fad and now another as the divine device which was going to change nature, to change human nature, and to transform the world. One after another these much-applauded fads have failed, as intelligent men knew from the start that they would fail. Image after image, fad after fad has gone to the scrap heap. What a motley assortment of exploded panaceas lie along the pathway of the years, from the Tower of Babel, which was to lift the race to heaven, to the image of Nebuchadnezzar, which was to unify mankind; from the Reign of Terror to the single tax; from Karl Marx to kultur; from socialism to Bolshevism. Each one of these grotesque images was heralded at the time as the latest revelation from heaven and as the greatest treasure of humanity. But they were all worse than useless. They were blights so long as they were tolerated, and always the race escaped from them with thanksgiving and forgot them as soon as possible. The real treasure of the race is not these panaceas, these fads, not the golden images, the grotesque devices and systems set up by visionaries. The real treasure of mankind is independence.

"The real benefactors of the race are not the egoistic contrivers of these images, not the Evarras of Kipling's poem, the framers of ideals for others to serve, the makers of monstrous gods for others to worship. The real benefactors are the Shadrachs, the Meshachs, the Abednegos of the ages, who champion independence, the independence of individuality and the independence of nationality, against the interferences of fanatics and the dictation of autocrats.

"These three Hebrew heroes knew it would be useless to argue with Nebuchadnezzar or his henchmen about this image; useless to point out its impossible absurdities and its fatal defects. In that hysterical hour truth, reason, science, philosophy, history, and common sense would have been pearls cast before swine. So they said, 'O, Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter.' All they could do in such a time was to stand firmly for independence. They knew that such a stand meant the burning fiery furnace. They did not crave this, but bad as it was and much as they would have preferred to avoid it, there was one thing which to them seemed worse, and that was the surrender of independence to external dictation. They made their choice, took their stand, and spoke out fear-

lessly, 'O, Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. But be it known unto thee, we will not worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'

"Those words are the everlasting declaration of the rights of individuality, the Magna Charta of independence.

"This is what all the real benefactors have done in all ages.

"They have championed this greatest treasure of mankind, and refused to surrender the independence of individuality or of nationality to visionary, autocrat, or mob.

"That is what our forefathers did on July 4, 1776, on the Independence Day, whose anniversary we have just celebrated. They championed and refused to surrender or betray the independence of America. They faced the burning fiery furnace of war. It was not a pleasant prospect. They did not want war. To avoid it they were ready to do everything save one. One thing seemed to them worse than even the furnace of war, and that was to betray the independence of America to external control. That they would not do. Their reply is known to the ages. The shot fired by the embattled farmers beside Concord bridge was heard round the world. Like the three Hebrew heroes they answered, 'We will not. Fiery furnace or no fiery furnace, war or no war, we will never surrender the independence of America nor betray the individuality of this New World.'

"That is the reason why all generations will revere them as patriots and praise them as benefactors of humanity, because they defended and preserved this priceless treasure of man, this crown of human life.

"This is the eternal question continually arising generation after generation, Shall human life preserve its independence?

"To-day two passionate delusions menace this treasure. On the one hand, socialism would surrender the independence of individuality to the crowd and submerge it in the mob. On the other hand, internationalism would surrender the independence of the Nation to a crowd of nations and submerge nationality in a mob of peoples.

"Shall independence be preserved or shall it be surrendered?

"To preserve it burning fiery furnaces must be faced to-day as always. The air is full of threats, threats of the wars, the anarchies, the Bolshevism, the taxes, into which those will be cast who do not immediately at the appointed signal fall down and worship when the tootings of the well-organized orchestra fill the land. No one wants war ever again. No one, I imagine, wants any more taxes. Long-suffering citizens have been taxed beyond reason or need. But if it were a question of surrendering independence or of being cast into even the worst fiery furnace that an angry Nebuchadnezzar could stir up, then there would be only one course open for genuine Americans; there would be only one conclusion possible for worthy descendants of the founders of this Republic under the shadow of Independence Day.

"The independence of America, the individuality of this Republic is the most precious political treasure of mankind to-day. It is worth more to the race; it means more to the future, infinitely more, than all the preposterous images constructed by visionary egotists through all the ages. If we were faced by the terrible dilemma and compelled to choose between the dread alternatives, either of surrendering this independent nationality, and submerging the individuality of this New World in a chaotic internationalism and falling down to accept an ill-considered device misnamed an ideal, or of being cast into a furnace heated seven times more than it was wont to be heated, as Nebuchadnezzar threatened, then, so long as the spirit of July Fourth burned in American hearts, so long as the manhood and nobility of the patriots of 1776 glowed in American breasts, the decision would be instantaneous and enthusiastic. Not selfishly; not because our eyes are on the ground; but just because we have genuine vision; for the sake of this poor world, for the sake of struggling humanity, the independence of America, the individuality of this Republic shall be preserved inviolate and unweakened and shall never be surrendered to external control, no matter what threats may be held over us. The answer of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego would again echo in every heroic soul, 'Be it known unto thee, we will not.'

"The independence of America, the individuality of this New World! The patriots of 1776 secured it; the patriots of 1860 preserved it; the patriots of 1918 fought and died for it in France. Washington and Lincoln were men of vision. They were not visionaries. They followed a genuine ideal, not a will-o'-the-wisp, not a poisonous, phosphorescent vapor exuding from the festering marsh of egotism. The independence of the United States for which they struggled is the hope of the world and the treasure of the race. So long as Americans have any real vision, so long as they are philanthropists and patriots, they will see that it is preserved, even though burning, fiery furnaces must be faced.

"The words of the beloved poet of Massachusetts and America seem written especially for such a time as this:

"Sail on, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity, with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee;
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, if this is the hour of the exchange editor, I ask that an article by Mr. Simonds on the breakdown of the principles embodied in the covenant be added to the sum total of literary provender supplied the printer.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"SEIZURE OF FIUME SEEN AS TREATY DEFIANCE—MR. SIMONDS BELIEVES VERSAILLES DOCUMENT DEAD LETTER AS AFFECTING NATIONALISTIC ASPIRATIONS OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES.

"[By Frank H. Simonds.]

"The exploit of D'Annunzio at Fiume has recalled for the whole world that equally brilliant page in Italian history filled with the story of the adventure of Garibaldi and his thousand when they set out from Quarto, almost 60 years ago, on that expedition which gave Italy her first real foretaste of unity.

"The circumstances are hardly dissimilar. Before Garibaldi set out, the King and the great architect of Italian unity, Cavour, knew of the plan. The attack upon a friendly State, the Kingdom of Naples, itself under the protection of the European concert, at least theoretically, has a strong resemblance to the present attack upon Yugoslavia. Moreover, as England looked with undisguised satisfaction at the gallant culmination of so long and brave an effort on the part of the Italians to obtain unity, not a few Frenchmen, probably a certain number of Britons, regard the new incident with approval.

"SAYS TREATY IS PARTLY DEAD.

"The truth of the matter must now begin to appear to the American people, as it has long been clear in Europe. In so far as the treaty of Versailles has done violence to the nationalistic aspirations of the various nations united against Germany, it has become a dead letter, less than six months after it was signed and before it has been ratified either by France or the United States.

"A few weeks ago Roumanians demonstrated by their march to Budapest their supreme contempt for the mandates of the Paris conference. Not only did they go to Budapest against orders, but they have remained there ever since. At the same time they have continued to hold the territory occupied by their soldiers, but forbidden them by the conference of Paris, notably in the case of Bessarabia, a Province three times as big as Alsace-Lorraine.

"The Roumanian episode, as I pointed out at the time, was manifestly only a beginning. Roumania, in going to Budapest, was really making the test case for Italy and for all the other nations which regarded the Paris conference and its decisions with resentment. It was, in fact, a matter of life or death for the Paris conference to bring Roumania to terms, because if Roumania were able to flout it, to deny its authority and proceed on her own way, then there would be no obstacle in the pathway of other nations.

"But, apart from notes, warnings, threats of economic pressure, which seem hardly to have been made good, the conference of Paris could do nothing. French sentiment would not permit the employment of French troops against the Roumanians; Italy undeniably advised Roumania to make the test; as for Britain and the United States, neither country was in a mood to make war in the Balkans, and real war, too, for Roumania can put at least 300,000 veteran troops in the field, with an equally large trained reserve.

"Paris, therefore, having told the Roumanians not to go to Budapest, and then, when they disobeyed, to get out of Budapest, ended by relapsing into painful silence, rather ridiculously broken by protests against a Roumanian evacuation of Budapest, which might be followed by a return of Bolshevism. So far as the Roumanians were concerned, they got what they wanted, they did as they pleased, and no one has yet found a way to punish them or to deprive them of territory actually in their possession, but not awarded them by the Paris conference.

"GOT CUE FROM ROUMANIA.

"Logically enough, Italy read in the Roumanian episode, in which she certainly played at least a friendly part, the real solution of her own difficulties. Her troops occupied Fiume and certain Dalmatian ports claimed by the Italians as well. But there were allied troops there also. After many months, following Mr. Wilson's famous Paris appeal to the Italian people, it was clear

that the whole Italian Nation, the radicals quite as unanimously as the conservatives, insisted that Fiume should be Italian.

"All the hope of acquiring title to Fiume through negotiations was at an end. Mr. Wilson could not recede from his position of the spring, because he had affirmed the question to be moral before it was political. But, impossible as was the task of acquiring title with American consent, there was nothing in the way of actually completing Italian possession, save the reserve of the Italian Government, which feared that an overt act might lead to the denial to Italy of the loans and other assistance terribly needed.

"On the other hand, Roumania had managed to survive, and the rising national spirit of resentment made it difficult for the Italian Government longer to stand in the pathway of national aspiration, even when it was led to such a position by a wise regard for national welfare. Nothing then was more natural than that the way out of the dilemma should be found in the revival of one of the most glorious and romantic episodes in all history.

"Of course, the Italian ministry knew of the D'Annunzio plan, just as Cavour and the King were thoroughly conversant with Garibaldi's plan. Not to perceive this is to be a dupe of a maneuver which has deceived no one on the other side of the Atlantic. Moreover, D'Annunzio was a particularly available leader for such a venture, since he had actually forced the reluctant Italian Government into the war on the allied side in May, 1915, and there was due him the gratitude of the statesmen and publics of the allied nations, for whom Italy's entrance, at the very moment of the great Russian defeat at the Duna, was almost a life-saving affair.

"Accordingly D'Annunzio took Fiume, the Italian officers in his pathway politely effaced themselves, the Italian Nation made no attempt to disguise its approval and enthusiasm. The Government, which could not have lived a moment had it undertaken to use force, and as certainly could not have commanded any Italian force to attack Fiume, politely turned the task over to the Allies, after certain delays, not disadvantageous to D'Annunzio.

"Terribly sorry; but we can't just manage to do this thing; awkward for us to attempt to deal with this wild fellow; please take it in your own hands.' Such was the burden of the Italian official statement. Meantime Garibaldi's imitator was well established in Fiume and actually embarrassed by the influx of volunteers. What nation in Europe desired to undertake to expel him, knowing full well that Italian national sentiment would be up in arms in a moment and a war with Italy was an immediate possibility, while, if the war did not come at once, enduring hatred would be the consequence? Not France; certainly least of all France, with an Italian frontier and a German menace still to be thought of. Not Great Britain, out of humor with fighting, whether at Archangel or Fiume, and anxious, like the United States, to get its troops home and have done with war-making for a time.

"ECONOMIC PRESSURE DANGEROUS.

"As for economic pressure, the thing was only a little less dangerous. How could one starve the Italians and the inhabitants of Fiume, while the Italian Navy dominated the Adriatic and the Italian Army and Navy openly celebrated the recent coup? As in the case of Roumania, the weapons, direct and indirect, turned out to be unavailable under the circumstances. Italy stayed at Fiume as Roumania had tarried at Budapest, and, in the delay, the opposition in European capitals grew steadily less. This is a personal matter between the President of the United States and the Italian people. Why should we interfere?

"This was the temper discoverable in France, within limits in Great Britain.

"Now, it seems perfectly clear that Italy will keep Fiume; she has it, the whole nation is resolved upon retaining it, and there is no one of the nations represented at Paris, no concert of nations, ready to begin a brand-new war in order to expel Italy from an Italian town, albeit the town which is the natural seagate for the southern Slavs. There was no one ready to take up arms to drive the Roumanians out of Bessarabia; there will be no one to drive the Roumanians out of the Banat, if they make good their threats and take the Torontal, allotted to Serbia at Paris.

"WHO WILL DISCIPLINE GREECE?

"Again, will there be anyone to discipline Greece if she proceeds to occupy that portion of Thrace which the Paris conference can not make up its mind to give to her, although it has subtracted it from Bulgaria? At the very least I should not be surprised to see the Greeks try out the matter before many days. Why shouldn't they? Their claim to this portion of Thrace is several thousand years old and stands the rigorous test of the 14 points quite as well as Fiume.

"But the case of Greece is relatively minor. The world will possibly worry along with Hellenic troops in Dedeağatch, as the world endured the temporary stay of Bulgarian troops in the same region. As far as France and Great Britain are concerned, they will welcome such a solution, for the United States is the only quarter in which the Bulgar has any friends, and President Wilson is the sole opponent to the Paris proposal to give all of Thrace to the Greeks. What is really important now is the effect of the Fiume episode upon the other parts of Europe.

"Let us take, for example, the case of the Saar Valley. The French have it. They own or will own every coal mine; they are authorized to extend their customs lines to include this territory. Fifteen years in the future they will have to submit to a plebiscite to decide whether the territory shall go back to Germany or remain French. But this condition was imposed solely because the President of the United States set his face against an out-and-out annexation, as inconsistent with the 14 points. But since Italy and Roumania are not permitting President Wilson's views to prevent them from acquiring territory on which they have a claim, not more justifiable, one would say, than the French claim to the Saar, why should France permit herself to be restrained?

"PROPOSED FRENCH TREATY.

"Further than this, Mr. Wilson, for the United States, pledged, so far as he could pledge it, an American alliance to protect France against a German attack in the future. Only by this pledge did Mr. Wilson persuade Clemenceau to abandon the claims of Foch and the French Army to the military occupation of the left bank of the Rhine. Now, if the treaty of Versailles, particularly in the parts regarded as vital to protect French interests, is amended in the Senate—above all, if the United States Senate refuses to ratify the treaty insuring France against German attack—what is more certain than that France, which has not yet ratified the treaty herself, will, with equal promptness, add amendments of her own?

"We are, then, passing rapidly out of the zone momentarily created by the league of nations circumstances at Paris. The Italians, the Roumanians, and the Jugo-Slavs have openly defied the whole Paris conference. The Roumanians and the Italians have proceeded to the occupation of territory expressly forbidden them by the Paris conference and in open defiance of league of nations principles. At any moment we may find that the Clemenceau government will fall and be succeeded, not as certain misguided 'liberals' in the United States think, by a radical ministry, but by a reactionary one—reactionary in the sense that it will repudiate the whole treaty as framed at Versailles and proceed to use the power now in French hands to safeguard the French future.

"The fact is, of course, that the Germans could not now defend themselves against the French if the French chose to send armies to Berlin; they could go with the approximate ease with which the Roumanian armies reached Budapest.

"Moreover, the recent murder of French soldiers in the Saar Basin, the refusal of the Germans to retire from the Baltic Province, their outrageous behavior in Upper Silesia—all these supply admirable justifications for such a French course.

"Once such a step was taken then there would be an obvious end of the treaty of Versailles. The statesmen who carried through such a program would not hesitate to take such safeguards for the future as have not been taken by the Clemenceau government solely because it relied upon President Wilson's assurance that he would be able to procure the ratification, both of the treaty of Versailles and the treaty of alliance. France would then enter into permanent occupation of the Rhine barrier and annex the Saar Basin. In doing this she would go no further than has Italy or Roumania, and she might be assured the support of both Latin powers as a consequence.

"This possible French procedure would be described as imperialistic by a certain fraction of American and British sentiment, which does not sympathize with France in any event and regards with utmost disapproval French apprehension of a new German attack. But most reasonable Englishmen and Americans will see in French effort to achieve security against German aggression a natural and inevitable national instinct. Above all, neither Americans nor Britons will be prepared to make war upon France, which is the essential fact.

"FRANCE WAITING ON THE UNITED STATES.

"In my judgment future French action will be entirely dependent upon the course of the United States Senate in adopting or rejecting the treaty of alliance. The French are not interested in the league of nations, do not believe in it, and have accepted it only as a matter of policy, not as an act of faith. If the Senate rejects the treaty of alliance the French will in their own time and in their own way follow the example of the

Roumanians and the Italians; they will proceed to the absorption of the Saar Basin, and find adequate justification for a permanent occupation of the left bank of the Rhine. Such a course will, in the end, have the same support in France as D'Annunzio's Fiume venture has enlisted in Italy.

"Had the United States Senate accepted the treaty of Versailles without delay and by a unanimous, or approximately unanimous, vote the European reaction would have been far different from what it now is. It was the undisguised conviction of both the French and British representatives at Paris that the President was supported by the mass of American people, without regard to party, in his European course. France bowed to certain entirely unpalatable demands of the President simply because France needed American financial assistance and feared that any other course would deprive her of this aid. Italy, at least, hesitated in the matter of Fiume. Roumania listened for the moment, biding her time. As for Poland, she consented to the greatest sacrifices of all, as her need of American support was the most considerable of all.

"But what has happened in America since the President returned has been at once a surprise and a shock to the European statesmen. The extent of the opposition to the President in the Senate has already called forth debate in the French Chamber, and if the treaty be modified and the treaty of alliance rejected may result in an upset in French politics. If America is not unanimous in its support of President Wilson's policies as they affect France and Italy, as they affect all European nations; if there is no possibility of winning American sympathy and support by accepting American ideas, as expressed by the President, at real sacrifices of national security and aspiration, then Europe is prepared to reject them, is already rejecting them.

"Fiume, like Budapest, is an incident of world-wide concern. It is a natural and consecutive step. It reveals Italy following the Roumanian precedent, a rebel against the moral and the political authority asserted by the Paris conference. It discloses a great power resolved to follow its own policies, consult its own interests, even when these interests conflict with principles which were proclaimed at Paris as the new constitution of the world. It is a repudiation of the idea that Italians can think other than as Italians when a question of national sentiment is at stake. When he addressed his appeal to the Italian people over the heads of the Italian ministry a few months ago President Wilson had the opposite idea.

"But Fiume is only a step; far more important steps are still to come. We shall see a French general election at no distant date, and we may see a French ministry fall before the election, for the American episodes have been terribly expensive for the Clemenceau ministry, which has held on up to the present moment only by reason of the promised treaty of alliance, and any new French ministry would, in my judgment, adopt a far different course with respect of Germany than the Clemenceau ministry has been led to adopt in the belief that such a course was necessary to enlist essential American aid for France.

"IDEALISM GIVING WAY.

"But whether the treaty of alliance and the treaty of Versailles be rejected, amended materially, or accepted as the President asks that they shall be accepted, it seems to me that we are doomed to pass rapidly, are actually passing from world policies founded upon idealism to those based upon realism. The Italians and the Roumanians have very frankly disclosed their total unwillingness to sacrifice territory or security to any general scheme of pacification and good feeling. No sacrifice was asked of the British, but in advance they announced that they would not make any surrender in the one direction where it might be asked, namely, in the matter of the 'freedom of the seas.'

"So far the French and the Poles have been asked to make great sacrifices, asked by President Wilson, in the name of the world peace, and both have consented, but with misgivings and against the wishes of many Frenchmen and Poles. But now it becomes clear that the French and the Poles alone of the European nations, one on the Vistula, the other on the Rhine, have given up security, while America seems by no means ready to accept the doctrines which at the President's behest France and Poland accepted. In addition, the security promised each in the league of nations and in the France-American-British alliance begins to seem insubstantial, to say the least.

"As I see it, this can only have one consequence, namely, a resettlement of many of the questions 'settled' or compromised in the Paris conference, questions such as Danzig, the Rhine barrier, the Saar Basin, Thrace, and not impossibly the Banat and Dalmatia. The Paris conference decisions were actually a compromise between the American idea, as Mr. Wilson's views were invariably described abroad, and the European idea. Now, Italy and Roumania have repudiated any compromise and insisted upon settling their problems in a thoroughly European fashion,

while the United States, so far as the Senate is concerned, at least, has challenged the American idea, and the resulting political debate in America has disclosed a divided sentiment. Therefore it seems to me that France, Poland, and the rest of the continental nations will swiftly or slowly—the French have many years to decide in the matter of the Saar and the Rhine, as the circumstances dictate—seek a continental solution, conforming with Italian and Roumanian action."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. STERLING. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6810, being the national prohibition bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report will be read. The Secretary read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 20, 25, 46, 47, 61, 66, 72, 90, 118, 123, 127, 133, 134, 164, 178, 184, 219, 232, and 233.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131, 132, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 228, 229, 230, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, and 285, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Provided, That the foregoing definition shall not extend to dealcoholized wine nor to any beverage or liquid produced by the process by which beer, ale, porter, or wine is produced, if it contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and is made as prescribed in section 37 of Title II of this act, and is otherwise denominated than as beer, ale, or porter, and is contained and sold in, or from, such sealed and labeled bottles, casks, or containers as the commissioner may by regulation prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Provided, That the foregoing definition shall not extend to dealcoholized wine nor to any beverage or liquid produced by the process by which beer, ale, porter, or wine is produced, if it contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and is made as prescribed in section 37 of this title, and is otherwise denominated than as beer, ale, or porter, and is contained and sold in, or from, such sealed and labeled bottles, casks, or containers as the commissioner may by regulation prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and the commissioner is authorized to make such regulations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Officers mentioned in said section 1014 are authorized to issue search warrants under the limitations provided in Title XI of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. L., p. 217, et seq.)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "to the end that the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prevented. Liquor for nonbeverage purposes and wine for sacramental purposes may be manufactured, purchased, sold, bartered, transported, imported, exported, delivered, furnished, and possessed, but only as herein provided, and the commissioner may, upon application, issue permits therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall prohibit the purchase and sale of warehouse receipts covering distilled spirits on deposit in Government bonded warehouses, and no special tax liability shall attach to the business of purchasing and selling such warehouse receipts"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "use as a beverage, or for intoxicating beverage purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and preserved sweet cider"; and on page 11, line 15, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "other article"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the articles named in paragraphs b, c, and d of this section which may be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "20"; and on page 12, line 7, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "the person"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "any known principal for"; and on page 12, line 8, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "if any"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and except that any person who in the opinion of the commissioner is conducting a bona fide hospital or sanatorium engaged in the treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism, may, under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the commissioner shall prescribe, purchase, and use, in accordance with the methods in use in such institution, liquor, to be administered to the patients of such institution under the direction of a duly qualified physician employed by such institution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "transport liquor, may be issued for one year, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the commissioner may, without formal application or new bond, extend any permit granted under this act or laws now in force after August 31 in any year to December 31 of the succeeding year: *Provided further*, That permits to purchase liquor for

the purpose of manufacturing or selling as provided in this act shall not be in force to exceed 90 days from the day of issuance. A permit to purchase liquor for any other purpose shall not be in force to exceed 30 days. Permits"; and, on page 13, line 22, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "Every permit"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In addition to the words proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, strike out, on page 13, line 25, of the engrossed bill the words "and shall not be in force more than"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "10"; and, beginning on page 13, line 25, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "10 days from the day of its issuance," which end on page 14, line 1; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "unless the sale is to be made through a pharmacist designated in the permit and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Nothing in this title shall be held to apply to the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, possession, or distribution of wine for sacramental purposes, or like religious rites, except section 6 (save as the same requires a permit to purchase) and section 10 hereof, and the provisions of this act prescribing penalties for the violation of either of said sections. No person to whom a permit may be issued to manufacture, transport, import, or sell wines for sacramental purposes or like religious rites shall sell, barter, exchange, or furnish any such to any person not a rabbi, minister of the gospel, priest, or an officer duly authorized for the purpose by any church or congregation, nor to any such except upon an application duly subscribed by him, which application, authenticated as regulations may prescribe, shall be filed and preserved by the seller. The head of any conference or diocese or other ecclesiastical jurisdiction may designate any rabbi, minister, or priest, to supervise the manufacture of wine to be used for the purposes and rites in this section mentioned, and the person so designated may, in the discretion of the commissioner, be granted a permit to supervise such manufacture."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "liquor. And no"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "unless after careful physical examination of the person for whose use such prescription is sought, or if such examination is found impracticable, then upon the best information obtainable, he"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In addition to the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment strike out, on page 15, lines 11 and 12 of the engrossed bill, the words "its use as a medicine by the one for whom he prescribes" and insert "the use of such liquor as a medicine by such person"; also on page 15, line 13, after the word "some" of the engrossed bill, insert the word "known"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "the purpose or ailment for which it is to be used and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "holding permits to prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the

Senate insert the following: "prescription blanks have been"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "except in cases of emergency, in which event a record and report shall be made and kept as in other cases"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the judicial district and within," and on page 17, line 16 of the engrossed bill, after the word "occurred" insert "unless the parties agree on another place"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "which shall at all times be open to inspection as in this act provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "to purchase or ship the same, together with the name and address of the person using the permit"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "No one shall permit any sign or billboard containing such advertisement to remain upon one's premises"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "No"; and, on page 22, line 12, after the word "receive," of the engrossed bill, insert the following: "nor knowingly permit his employee to solicit or receive"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 23. That any person who shall, with intent to effect a sale of liquor, by himself, his employee, servant, or agent, for himself or any person, company or corporation, keep or carry around on his person, or in a vehicle, or other conveyance whatever, or leave in a place for another to secure, any liquor, or who shall travel to solicit, or solicit, or take, or accept orders for the sale, shipment, or delivery of liquor in violation of this title is guilty of a nuisance and may be restrained by injunction, temporary and permanent, from doing or continuing to do any of said acts or things.

"In such proceedings it shall not be necessary to show any intention on the part of the accused to continue such violations if the action is brought within sixty days following any such violation of the law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the containers thereof"; and on page 27, line 17, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "other property" and insert "such property so"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "unless the court shall otherwise order"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The term 'private dwelling' shall be construed to include the room or rooms used and occupied not transiently but solely as a residence in an apartment house, hotel, or boarding house. The property seized on any such warrant shall not be taken

from the officer seizing the same on any writ of replevin or other like process."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "brought for violation of law"; and on page 30, line 13, after the word "of" in the engrossed bill insert "if not claimed within 60 days from the date this section takes effect"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The penalties provided in this act against the manufacture of liquor without a permit shall not apply to a person for manufacturing nonintoxicating cider and fruit juices exclusively for use in his home, but such cider and fruit juices shall not be sold or delivered except to persons having permits to manufacture vinegar."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "reported, provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the commissioner or any of his agents or by any public prosecutor or by any person designated by him, or by any peace officer in the State where the record is kept, and copies of such records and reports duly certified by the person with whom kept or filed may be introduced in evidence with like effect as the originals thereof, and verified copies of such records shall be furnished to the commissioner when called for"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "shall be assessed against, and collected from, the person responsible for such illegal manufacture or sale"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Provided, That such liquid may be removed and transported, under bond and under such regulations as the commissioner may prescribe, from one bonded plant or warehouse to another for the purpose of having the alcohol extracted therefrom. And such liquids may be developed, under permit, by persons other than the manufacturers of beverages containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and sold to such manufacturers for conversion into such beverages."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Credit shall be allowed on the tax due on any alcohol so saved to the amount of any tax paid upon distilled spirits or brandy used in the fortification of the liquor from which the same is saved.

"When fortified wines are made and used for the production of nonbeverage alcohol, and dealcoholized wines containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, no tax shall be assessed or paid on the spirits used in such fortification, and such dealcoholized wines produced under the provisions of this act, whether carbonated or not, shall not be subject to the tax on artificially carbonated or sparkling wines, but shall be subject to the tax on still wines only.

"In any case where the manufacturer is charged with manufacturing or selling for beverage purposes any malt, vinous, or fermented liquids containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume, or in any case where the manufacturer, having been permitted by the commissioner to develop a liquid such as ale, beer, porter, or wine containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume in the manner and for the purpose herein provided, is charged with failure to reduce the alcoholic content of any such liquid below such one-half of 1 per cent before withdrawing the same from the factory, then in either such case the burden of proof shall be on such manufacturer to

show that such liquid so manufactured, sold, or withdrawn contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume. In any suit or proceeding involving the alcoholic content of any beverage, the reasonable expense of analysis of such beverage shall be taxed as costs in the case."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "except such executive officers as may be appointed by the commissioner or the Attorney General to have immediate direction of the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and persons authorized to issue permits, and agents and inspectors in the field service"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "required"; and on page 37, line 5, after the word "Act," in the engrossed bill insert: "including personal services in the District of Columbia, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,000,000 for the use of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and \$100,000 for the use of the Department of Justice for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, including personal services in the District of Columbia and necessary printing and binding"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the use of any scientific university or college of learning, any laboratory for use exclusively in scientific research, or for use in any hospital or sanatorium"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 20. That it shall be unlawful to import or introduce into the Canal Zone, or to manufacture, sell, give away, dispose of, transport, or have in one's possession or under one's control within the Canal Zone, any alcoholic, fermented, brewed, distilled, vinous, malt, or spirituous liquors, except for sacramental, scientific, pharmaceutical, industrial, or medicinal purposes, under regulations to be made by the President, and any such liquors within the Canal Zone in violation hereof shall be forfeited to the United States and seized: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to liquor in transit through the Panama Canal or on the Panama Railroad.

"That each and every violation of any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding six months for a first offense, and by a fine not less than \$200 nor more than \$2,000 and imprisonment not less than one month nor more than five years for a second or subsequent offense.

"That all offenses heretofore committed within the Canal Zone may be prosecuted and all penalties therefor enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as if this act had not been passed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS STERLING,
KNUTE NELSON,
LEE S. OVERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. VOLSTEAD,
DICK T. MORGAN,
E. Y. WEBB,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 5218. An act to provide revenue for the Government and to establish and maintain the production of magnesite ores and manufactures thereof in the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 151) to provide additional compensation for employees of the Postal Service, and making an appropriation therefor. This is a measure which has passed the House increasing the salaries of the postal em-

ployees. The Senate committee has reported on the matter, and I ask for its consideration at this time.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the report was submitted only yesterday. It was not printed until this morning, and, indeed, I am not sure that it has been printed as yet. It involves some very important matters. It calls for the appropriation of a large sum. I think the Senator ought not to press the consideration of that measure now, so that we may have an opportunity to examine the report and examine the measure itself.

I ask the Senator not to press consideration until to-morrow and give us a chance to examine the report. I do not want to be called upon to object, but I do think that the importance of the measure is such as to warrant an opportunity for Senators to examine the report and to examine the joint resolution.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very willing and very anxious, indeed, that the Senator should understand this proposition. It, however, has been before Congress for a long time, the House having passed the resolution some months ago; and if the Senator has in mind urging objections to the consideration of the measure to-morrow, or on any other day, if it goes over, I would rather move now to take it up. If, however, in good faith the Senator asks more time to consider the report—and I am bound to believe that that is the case—I certainly do not wish to oppose his request; but the Senator understands that with the press of business that is before the Senate, unless we can act upon some of these matters during the morning hour there will be no opportunity for us to give consideration to them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I have no desire whatever to object to the consideration of this bill, but it is an important one; the report has just been laid before the Senate, and I have not had time to examine it, and I doubt whether half a dozen Senators have had a chance to read the report. If it may go over until to-morrow, that is all I ask, and I shall join with the Senator to-morrow in asking the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, before the Senator determines which course he will take, I should like to suggest that it would be helpful to all of us if the chairman of the committee would explain the bill briefly and then let it go over until to-morrow for us to continue the discussion.

Mr. KING. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be very glad to do that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If that could be done, I know it would be helpful to all of us.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will cheerfully do that.

I think it is an almost universally recognized fact that the Post Office Department is in need of relief. The House of Representatives recognizes this fact, and granted a temporary increase in salary of postal employees for this fiscal year of \$150 each, in addition to the compensation provided in the last Post Office appropriation bill. The committee of the Senate has spent a great deal of time on this subject, has investigated the needs of the department, and finds that much of the difficulty arises from the fact that an insufficient number of employees can be secured and retained in the service to meet the postal demands. The Postmaster General insists that an appropriation of a few millions of dollars, giving him discretion as to the expenditure of the amount, would meet the condition. Neither committee of Congress agreed with him or felt like granting him discretion. They felt, in view of past experiences, that it was absolutely necessary for the Congress to determine what amount should be granted to relieve the emergency condition and to direct specifically how it should be expended. The Postmaster General either does not understand the true condition in his own department or he is not frank with Congress. The committee does not believe it is the duty of Congress to compete with salaries paid by corporations in the ordinary industries of the country. It does feel, however, that it should pay a sufficient amount—and only a sufficient amount—now, which, with the strictest economy on the part of the employees, will enable them to live during the present emergency.

One of the greatest difficulties is experienced in securing substitutes. The substitute clerk or carrier under present law is paid 40 cents per hour. His hours of employment are uncertain. He serves three years before he gets a permanent appointment, and therefore he finds it to his convenience and to his welfare to take employment in other branches of industry. The result has been that most inefficient and insufficient help has been obtained.

It is a known fact that many of these substitutes work for a day or two and then leave the job. They have no notion of remaining in the service. The evidence is indisputable that many of the people whom the department has been obliged to

pick up were illiterate and could not even write their names. The evidence disclosed by employees' bonding companies as to some of these "noncertified" people was that when they made their applications they had to do it by making their marks.

It is known that the turnover of employees in many parts of the service has been several hundred per cent during the last year or two. Perhaps that is not greater than in the ordinary business concern, but you can readily understand that the Post Office Department must be a permanent institution. It is at the very basis of the business interests of the country. For that reason we have a civil-service system which governs the employee. It has been practically abandoned in so far as substitutes and those in the lower grades are concerned. The greatest separations from the service outside of substitutes have been made in the \$1,000, \$1,100, and \$1,200 grades.

Your committee felt that instead of granting a flat increase of \$150 per man, regardless of the salary which he received, the greater amount of the House appropriation should be given to those classes where the greatest separations have occurred and where the greatest difficulty has been experienced in securing adequate help. Therefore we increased the substitutes' pay from 40 cents to 60 cents an hour. We increased the \$1,000-a-year man from \$1,000 to \$1,240. In other words, we increased the latter's pay \$20 a month.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. Do not the postal employees share in the \$240 bonus for this year that was voted to all other Government employees by Congress?

Mr. TOWNSEND. They do. In stating the salaries of \$1,000, I am including the bonus. I am talking about the compensation which they actually receive.

Mr. MYERS. Do they already get the bonus of \$240?

Mr. TOWNSEND. They get \$200.

Mr. MYERS. And this bill will give them more?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right. Without the bonus, the salary of the low grade is \$800; but that man, under his compensation with the bonus which has been granted him, receives now \$1,000, according to the report that has been filed, which includes the \$200 bonus given to postal employees.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, what character of work has been done by the man who received only \$800?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is his first year in the service—clerical work. Eight hundred dollars is the basic salary, but he is given a bonus, not of \$240 but of \$200. I am recognizing the fact that he receives \$1,000. We propose to increase that compensation by \$240.

The department itself recognizes the fact that these first-year men, these entrance men, should receive more than \$1,000 with the bonus. So in this case we propose to increase the pay to \$1,240; we increase the \$1,100 and the \$1,200 man \$200, giving them \$1,300 and \$1,400, respectively; and we permit the House provision of \$150 to remain the same as to \$1,300, \$1,400, \$1,500, and \$1,600 men.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Does the joint resolution cover the employees in the department here?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It does.

Mr. NELSON. It covers all the employees?

Mr. TOWNSEND. All the employees.

Mr. NELSON. Of the Postal Service?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of the Postal Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator is in error when he says that the \$240 bonus applies to the employees of the post office.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not say it did. I said it did not. Somebody said \$240, but I said it was \$200.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that that is the regular promotion that is allowed the employees each year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; the Senator is mistaken. The regulation promotion is \$100 a year, and the bonus last year was \$200.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] asked the Senator from Michigan if the \$240 bonus granted to the Government employees applied to the post-office employees.

Mr. TOWNSEND. And I said it did not.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say that it did.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I said that, I misspoke, because I repeated that it was \$200. That is what I wanted to have understood.

Mr. MYERS. The general \$240 bonus does not apply to these employees, then?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It does not.

Mr. MYERS. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Understand me, Senators, so that there will be no mistake about it, the figures given in the joint resolution and in the report include all the compensation which the clerks are receiving to-day. That includes bonus and promotion, where there is promotion.

Mr. MOSES. I hope the Senator from Michigan will point out, before he leaves this particular part of his explanation, that in connection with the \$200 bonus for the first year of its application all automatic promotions in the department stop, so that the employees of the department, whom Congress had intended to benefit by a bonus of \$200, receive, as a matter of fact, only \$100.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That was true up to this year. This year they have made the ordinary promotions. But then they are a year behind, as the Senator from New Hampshire has stated. They are a year behind the salary they would have received from promotions if that rule had been followed.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I understand that a joint commission of the two Houses of Congress has been created to reclassify and readjust the salaries of the postal employees. I should like to inquire of the Senator if the increases in salary which the joint resolution proposes apply to those employees who are to be reclassified and their salaries adjusted by that commission?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The increases apply to all the employees of the Post Office Department mentioned in the joint resolution, those receiving not to exceed \$2,500 per year. The joint commission is investigating for future congressional action. Its business is to discover and report facts which will enable Congress to adjust the great inequalities which exist in the Post Office Department, and which the joint resolution does not seek to remedy. We are only proposing temporary relief for this year. We simply make increases in the appropriation act of the last Congress to meet the emergencies of this fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. This is not to apply to the compensation for the next fiscal year?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; it is only temporary.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to read the report presented by the committee. May I ask whether this increased compensation is to date back to the first of the year?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It dates back to July 1.

Mr. POMERENE. Of this year?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of this year.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will permit me—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. This matter has been called to my attention so repeatedly, and I have had such a mass of telegrams from, I think, every substantial village as well as city in the State of Ohio, that I am satisfied something very substantial must be done in behalf of the carriers and the clerks if we are to maintain a high standard of efficiency in the Post Office Service. I took occasion some time ago to telegraph to the postmasters in the large and small cities of Ohio to get their views as to conditions prevailing, and whatever information has come to me from them has been at my solicitation. I have quite a number of telegrams here bearing upon this subject; and if the Senator from Michigan will permit me, I should like to read one from Cleveland, because it is typical.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. POMERENE. This comes from the postmaster at Cleveland, and he says:

[Telegram.]

A conservative increase should be allowed city carriers, rural carriers, and clerks; difficult to recommend a definite amount because of the abnormal high price of food, clothing, and rents in this city, and no one seems to know just how long these exorbitant prices will continue. Fifty-four clerks and fifty-nine carriers resigned last 12 months on account low salaries; in addition 425 temporary clerks and 481 temporary carriers resigned for the same reason. These men would work a few days and resign, which accounts for the large number department has allowed this office—12 additional carriers and 50 clerks. However, the number of clerkships provided in the current appropriation bill have been apportioned, forcing this office to wait until such time as additional places are provided. When definitely allowed they can not be secured for two reasons: First, our civil-service register is exhausted; and, second, because of the rate of compensation. There exists in Cleveland a very serious shortage of all kinds of labor notwithstanding the fact that wages in excess of established scales are being paid. Post-office jobs are no longer attractive because of the high salaries paid by industrial companies, making it impossible to secure competent men for our service on account of low salaries.

The difficulty which the Cleveland post office has met with is duplicated in Cincinnati, Columbus, and Toledo, as well as in the smaller cities, like Canton, Youngstown, and Akron.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Especially Akron.

Mr. POMERENE. Yes. It is true also of Portsmouth and Springfield. It does seem to me that the Government has been very unfair with this class of employees, when we take into consideration the increased living cost, and the high wages which are paid for common labor. Many of these carriers and clerks, if they would go out and do even common labor, could get a better wage than that which requires the skill which is so necessary in the performance of the duties of their office. I am not only hoping that this joint resolution will be passed, but I hope it will be passed with a very substantial increase. We will have to do something along this line if we are to maintain the very high efficiency of the different post offices.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the Senator's statements as to the necessity for relief are corroborated by similar proofs from every State in the Union. These facts are known to every Senator, and it is impossible to successfully deny them. I do not assume that the Senator from Georgia desired me to talk so much upon the necessity of the joint resolution, but rather to explain its provisions.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I just felt that it would help us all, as we would look into the details of the measure during the next 24 hours if the Senator would give us the kind of explanation he is giving. I can not help feeling that everyone must realize the necessity for some such legislation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think everyone must realize it who looks into the subject even casually, because it is a most deplorable condition, which, I believe, menaces the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General either looks with complacency upon the matter or denies the emergency, which the experience of Senators shows to exist, which mayors, boards of trade, and business men all over the country insist does exist, and demand is made that Congress speedily remedy the situation so far as a living wage to postal employees will remedy it.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will.

Mr. HARRISON. From an examination of the joint resolution and the report I take it that the larger percentage of increase is on the smaller salaries.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes; that is true.

Mr. HARRISON. And the larger the salary, the smaller the percentage of increase?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

Mr. HARRISON. That is the rule?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON. In looking over the joint resolution I see that the fourth-class postmasters are provided only with a 10 per cent increase. Why is that distinction made? They are paid very small salaries, I understand, and, in carrying out the general rule, it would seem that you should give them a larger percentage of increase.

Mr. TOWNSEND. A great many fourth-class postmasters run the post offices as branch institutions to their business. They conduct other kinds of business besides that of a post office. Their clerks in their grocery stores, or dry-goods stores, or whatever they may be, frequently serve the post office, without special compensation. The Senator from Mississippi is absolutely right in suggesting that many of the fourth-class postmasters are grossly underpaid, and I am hopeful that the joint commission which has been established is going to be able to segregate the postmasters of the fourth class who are devoting their whole time to the post offices and those who have other businesses connected with them. The committee felt, as I said a moment ago, that it was not its province at this time to try to adjust equitably all the postal salaries in the United States. It has tried to propose something which would permit the functioning of the Post Office Department in as effective a manner as possible; that is, so far as the securing of efficient help is concerned. Therefore it retained the House proposition of a 10 per cent increase for fourth-class postmasters. In a great many of the cases that increase just about pays for their fuel and light. In some cases it does not, where the salary is larger and, perhaps, the expense greater. But in looking over the list of fourth-class postmasters I found that was approximately the expense of fuel and light for fourth-class post offices, and I thought that might be sufficiently far for us to go at this time.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator what is the average pay of a fourth-class postmaster? Is it two or three hundred dollars?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It runs all the way from \$200 to \$1,000. When it reaches \$1,000, the post office goes into the third class.

Mr. HARRISON. I have had my attention called to the fact, and I am sure the Senator has, that in a great many instances fourth-class post offices have been closed because they were unable to get anybody to serve as fourth-class postmasters, and that was due to the inadequate pay.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think that condition exists in many places; but those abandoned offices have generally been served by rural delivery—that is, their patrons have—and therefore the offices have been abandoned. Where it was found desirable to have a fourth-class office, I imagine they have not had any very great difficulty in getting some business man in the locality to take it, if he could pass the civil-service test. I repeat, we do not attempt to deal absolutely justly with fourth-class postmasters or with anybody else. It is rather an arbitrary provision we propose here, but after great consideration and considerable study, with information from the best sources we could obtain, the committee thought that the increase which we provide would be sufficient to carry the department over this crisis and until the joint commission has a chance to report and Congress can act upon its report. I have said in this report that if the cost of living is not reduced within the year, the increases which we have provided are going to be altogether insufficient and we will have to make another increase.

We have felt also that, in view of the action of the President in reference to the demand of the railroad men for increases in salary, we ought not at this time to impose any burdens upon the Treasury of the United States except such as were absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the Government. I think these increases are absolutely necessary. Some of the men who are to get these increases would have stayed in the service even if they had not had the promise of them. I also know that there are those who have remained in the department since July 1 upon the assurance that they were going to get relief of some kind. The House passed this joint resolution giving them notice that Congress was going to act, and therefore we make this retroactive to July 1, because, while I believe that most of these men are of the very highest patriotism and want to stay in the service, to which many of them have given their lives up to this date, and many of them feel that it is a patriotic duty to remain, I do not think the United States Government has any right to demand that they should stay at a sacrifice to the living of themselves and of their families. So we have attempted to meet this situation by the joint resolution.

If there is any other question to be asked relative to the provisions of the joint resolution I shall be very glad to answer it; but when the measure comes up for discussion I want to go a little more into detail as to some of the reasons why some emergency legislation should be enacted and why, in my judgment, this is the least that we can afford to do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what is the least amount that will be paid to fourth-class postmasters under the joint resolution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. The least is 10 per cent of his present compensation, whatever that is. It ranges from \$200 up to \$1,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the joint resolution increase the pay of fourth-class postmasters only 10 per cent?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Ten per cent of their present compensation.

I will say to the Senate that I suggested 15 per cent when the proposition was under consideration, but after talking with the Post Office Department, and after considering the condition of the Treasury, I felt that possibly these officers could exist for the present under a 10 per cent increase, and therefore it was made 10 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice this provision in the last appropriation act with reference to fourth-class postmasters:

Provided further, That if the compensation does not exceed \$75 for any one quarter, fourth-class postmasters shall be allowed an increase of 20 per cent of the compensation allowed under existing law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is, they get an excess of cancellations.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; and they get 20 per cent. It seems to me the fourth-class postmasters are paid so small a salary that they certainly can not live on what they get from the Government. They have got to do other business, and with a 10 per cent increase it seems to me they are not given the increase, in comparison with the other employees of the Government, that they should receive.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think the Senator's criticism is fairly just. The committee's only excuse is that a great many of these people are not dependent upon the salaries which they receive

from the Post Office Department. They could not live upon them; they could not maintain the offices for them; nobody presumes that they would. But in most cases they want the office in connection with their local business and they are permitted to do business in connection with it and conduct it purely as an accommodation to the public, although, as I said, if we were to base it upon the Federal compensation that they receive, it is insufficient standing by itself, and I am not trying to defend it on equitable grounds.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I am going to ask the indulgence of the Senate to-morrow morning to take up the joint resolution for consideration, because it truly is an emergency measure. I think it is easily understandable, and I ask Senators to read the report. I have endeavored to explain the details of the provisions. Some of them may seem rather arbitrary, but I have tried to give the reasons for them. I have tried to arrange the provisions of the resolution so that no one will receive for a certain grade of work a salary that is in excess of the salary paid for a higher grade of work. I had that in mind because I thought it would be easily adjustable after the report of the joint commission comes in and an effort is made properly to adjust the salaries of all of the employees of the Post Office Department. There is no equity in the present method. Some of the most grossly underpaid people, for the work they do, are supervisory officials. Men who handle millions of dollars, for which they are required to give large bonds, are getting a compensation which is exceeded by bank clerks even in some of the ordinary banks. Many of these men could obtain even in ordinary times double the salary the Government pays them. They are entitled to much greater pay.

So I ask Senators to give consideration to the report, in order that to-morrow morning we can take up the measure and dispose of it as soon as possible.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, it is very probable that the salaries of post-office employees should be rearranged, and that they should be increased. Almost every day since I have been here I have heard the administration criticized for extravagance in having unnecessary employees and for the high cost of running the Government. I undertook to investigate the matter and looked into this particular case. I have a copy of a letter which the Postmaster General wrote to the chairman of the committee, which I ask may be read by the Secretary. We certainly have one man who is in favor of economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1919.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Chairman Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of August 14, inclosing a communication from Mr. Everett C. Fish, president of the Michigan Council of Postal Associations, was brought to my attention upon my return to the city. In reply I wish to state that the conditions in the Postal Service as to the matter of securing employees are the same as in industrial institutions. At a few places in the United States, because of the extraordinary and unusual conditions prevailing, it is difficult to secure a sufficient number of employees. This condition, however, would not be remedied by increases in salaries as it is due solely to a shortage of labor. This condition is more pronounced at Detroit, Mich., than at any other city, and because of the extraordinary conditions prevailing at Detroit and a few other cities the department gave its approval to House joint resolution 151, as originally introduced by Representative MADDEN, which would have granted the Postmaster General the authority to increase the salaries of employees not to exceed 35 per cent of their basic salary in cities where extraordinary and unusual conditions prevail. It would enable the department to take care of any situation and to handle each case on its merits. A few million dollars spent under this resolution would amply provide for exigencies of the service. The resolution, however, as passed by the House eliminated this provision and provides for a flat increase of \$150 for each of the employees enumerated and will cost approximately \$40,000,000 per annum.

The statement frequently made by those interested in securing increases in salary for postal employees that the experienced employees are leaving the service by thousands is not borne out by the facts. There are regularly employed at the 125 largest post offices in the United States approximately 51,500 clerks and carriers. Of this number during the past year 4,701, approximately 9 per cent, resigned from the service. These cities include the industrial centers where the labor conditions are acute, and our information is that the turnover in such institutions has been from 75 to 300 per cent per annum. It will therefore be seen when this is compared with the turnover of 9 per cent in the Postal Service that the changes have been infinitesimal. There is no doubt that the turnover in the Postal Service has been less than that of any business institution. It also indicates clearly that the employees of the Postal Service are not to any great extent dissatisfied with their employment and are not leaving the service in the manner stated so frequently by the agitators who attempt to speak in their behalf. Of the 4,701 employees who resigned from the service 3,427 were in the \$1,000, or entrance grade.

The postal employees were granted on July 1 of this year an increase in most cases of \$100 in addition to the \$200 war bonus authorized last year and which has been continued during this fiscal year, and it is believed that with the exception of the few instances cited this is sufficient until the congressional commission which is now making an investigation of salaries in the Postal Service with a view to reclassifying same has completed its work and made its recommendation to Congress.

To grant the employees the \$150 increase provided in House joint resolution 151 will involve an additional expenditure of \$40,000,000, and as the revenues of the Postal Service, because of the increased salaries, are not now sufficient to meet the expenditure, it will place an additional burden of that amount upon the public. The resolution as amended, therefore, does not have my approval.

Very sincerely,

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

Mr. DIAL. There is a second letter, Mr. President, dated October 7, which I wish to have read also.

The Secretary read as follows:

OCTOBER 7, 1919.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
Chairman Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have noticed in statements contained in the press that your committee has agreed to report out House joint resolution 151, which provides for increases in salaries of postal employees of approximately \$38,000,000.

This matter was fully covered in my letter addressed to you recently, in which it was stated that the resolution as it passed the House did not have my approval. Extraordinary conditions do exist in a few places, and the salaries of the employees should be increased in such instances, and if authority were granted to do so, the department could amply care for the needs of the postal service at a cost of not more than \$2,000,000.

I feel it my duty to again call to your attention that an appropriation of \$38,000,000 for increased compensation to postal employees at this time, in my judgment, is unnecessary and would simply add a burden to that extent on the public, and which must be borne by taxation or otherwise, as the postal revenues will not be sufficient to meet it.

Very sincerely,

A. S. BURLISON,
Postmaster General.

BUILDING REGULATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I shall object to taking up the bill. We have Calendar Monday. A number of us are interested in measures on the calendar. Every time Calendar Monday comes along, some one asks unanimous consent to pass over the calendar for that day, and then bills on the calendar are taken up and everybody loses interest in the calendar. I have no doubt in the world that this bill will have speedy consideration and be speedily passed at any time when the calendar is called. Until next Monday, if I have any say in the matter at all, I shall object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the bill establishes a zoning commission in the District of Columbia to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District. It has passed the House, is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and I think meets with the approval generally of the people of the District. The commission provided for in the bill is composed of the District Commissioners, the officer in charge of public grounds of the District, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds. The commission must meet within six months after the passage of the bill and lay out the District into districts in which certain character of buildings will be permitted and certain other character of buildings prohibited. I shall be glad to go into a further explanation of the bill if Senators desire. I ask that the bill may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, and stated the first committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill be read and that the amendments be passed over at this time. When the bill shall have been read, we may then have the amendments stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reading of the bill will be continued.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill, which is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to protect the public health, secure the public safety, and to protect property in the District of Columbia there is hereby created a zoning commission, which shall consist of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, which said commission shall have all the powers and perform all the duties hereinafter specified and shall serve without additional compensation. Such employees of the government of the District of Columbia as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act shall be assigned to such duty by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia without additional compensation.

SEC. 2. That within six months after the passage of this act and after public notice and hearing as hereinafter provided, the said commission shall divide the District of Columbia into certain districts, to be known, respectively, as height, area, and use districts; and shall adopt regulations specifying the height and area of buildings thereafter to be erected or altered therein and the purposes for which buildings and premises therein may be used: *Provided*, That the permissible height of buildings in any district shall not exceed the maximum height of building now authorized upon any street in any part of that district by the act of Congress approved June 1, 1910, and amendments thereto, regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That no such districts shall be established, nor shall any regulations therefor be adopted, nor shall the height, area, or use of buildings to be erected therein be prescribed until said commission has afforded persons interested an opportunity to be heard at a public hearing as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That wherever, under the provision of this act, it is required that a public hearing shall be held, notice of the time and place of such hearing shall be published for not less than 10 consecutive days in one or more newspapers of general circulation printed and published in the District of Columbia; and such public hearing may be adjourned from time to time: *Provided*, That if the time and place of the adjourned meeting is publicly announced when the adjournment is had, no further notice of such adjourned meeting need be published.

SEC. 4. That after the public hearings herein provided for shall have been concluded, said commission shall definitely determine the number and boundaries of the districts which it is hereby authorized and directed to establish, and shall specify the height and area of the buildings which may thereafter be erected therein, and shall prescribe the purposes for which such buildings thereafter erected may or may not be used. Said districts so established shall not be changed except on order of said commission after public hearing. Said commission may initiate such changes, or they may be initiated upon the petition of the owners affected. Where the proposed change is to add a contiguous area to a use, height, or area district, the owners of at least 50 per cent of the street frontage proposed to be changed must join in the petition: *Provided*, That if the frontage proposed to be changed is not a contiguous area, the owners of at least 50 per cent of a frontage within the area not less than three blocks in length must join in such petition before it may be considered by said commission. No such change shall be made, either by said commission on its own motion or upon such petition, except with the unanimous vote of said commission, if the owners of at least 20 per cent of the frontage proposed to be changed protest against such change.

SEC. 5. That said commission is authorized and empowered to make such orders and adopt such regulations not inconsistent with law as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes and carry into effect the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no order or regulation so adopted shall require any change in the plans, construction, or designated use of (a) a building for which a permit shall have been issued, or plans for which shall be on file with the inspector of buildings of the District of Columbia at the time the orders or regulations authorized under this act are promulgated; or (b) a permit for the erection of which shall be issued within 30 days after promulgation of the orders or regulations authorized or adopted under this act and the construction of which in either of the above cases shall have been diligently prosecuted within a year from the date of such permit and the ground story framework of which, including the second tier of beams, shall have been completed within said year, and which entire building shall be completed according to such plans within two years of the date of the promulgation of such orders or regulations; or (c) prevent the restoration of a building partially destroyed by fire, explosion, act of God or the public enemy, or prevent the continuance of the use of such building or part thereof as such use existed at the time of such partial destruction, or prevent a change of such existing use except under the limitations provided herein in relation to existing buildings and premises: *Provided further*, That no frame building that has been damaged by fire or otherwise more than one-half of its original value shall be restored within the fire limits as provided by the building regulations of the District of Columbia; or (d) prevent the restoration of a wall declared unsafe by the inspector of buildings of the District or by a board of survey appointed in accordance with any existing law or regulation.

SEC. 6. That any lawful use of a building or premises existing at the time of the adoption of orders and regulations made under the authority of this act may be continued, although such use does not conform with the provisions hereof or with the provisions of such orders and regulations; and such use may be extended throughout the building, provided no structural alteration, except those required by law or regulation, is made therein and no new building is erected. Where the boundary line of any use district divides a lot in a single ownership at the time of the adoption of orders and regulations under the authority of this act, the commission may permit a use authorized on either portion of such lot to extend to the entire lot, but not more than 25 feet beyond the boundary line of the use district.

SEC. 7. That maps of the districts established by said commission and copies of all orders and regulations as to the height and area of buildings to be erected therein and as to the uses to which such buildings may be lawfully devoted, and copies of all other official orders and regulations of the commission shall be filed in the office of the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia. Copies of all orders and regulations shall be published in one or more newspapers printed in the District of Columbia for the information of all concerned.

SEC. 8. That it shall be unlawful to use or permit the use of any building or premises or part thereof hereafter created, erected, changed, or converted wholly or partly in its use or structure until a certificate of occupancy shall have been issued by authority of said zoning commission.

SEC. 9. That buildings erected, altered, or raised, or converted in violation of any of the provisions of this act or the orders and regulations made under the authority thereof are hereby declared to be common nuisances; and the owner or person in charge of or maintaining any such buildings, upon conviction on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants in the name of said District, and which court is hereby authorized to hear and determine such cases, shall be adjudged guilty of maintaining a common nuisance, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 per day for each and every day such nuisance shall be permitted to continue, and shall be required by said court to abate such nuisance. The corporation counsel of the District of Columbia

may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia to abate and perpetually enjoin such nuisance.

SEC. 10. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enforce the provisions of this act and the orders and regulations adopted by said zoning commission under the authority thereof, and nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make municipal regulations as heretofore: *Provided*, That such regulations are not inconsistent with the provisions of this law and the orders and regulations made thereunder. In interpreting and applying the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder they shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare. This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties: *Provided, however*, That as to all future building construction or use of premises where this act or any orders or regulations adopted under the authority thereof impose a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon height of building, or requires larger open spaces than are imposed or required by existing law, regulations, or permits, or by such easements, covenants, or agreements, the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder shall control.

SEC. 11. That all laws or parts of laws and regulations in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, in section 1, page 1, line 8, after the words "District of Columbia," to insert "the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission," so as to read:

That to protect the public health, secure the public safety, and to protect property in the District of Columbia there is hereby created a zoning commission, which shall consist of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Borah	Harris	McNary	Smoot
Brandagee	Harrison	Nelson	Spencer
Calder	Hitchcock	New	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dial	Kenyon	Norris	Tammell
Fletcher	Keyes	Nugent	Wadsworth
France	King	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	La Follette	Penrose	Watson
Gerry	Lenroot	Pittman	Williams
Gronna	Lodge	Pomerene	
Hale	McCormick	Sheppard	
Harding	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absent Senators.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. JONES of New Mexico, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts answered to their names when called.

Mr. ASHURST, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. COLT, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. MOSES, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. BALL, Mr. WARREN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. FERNALD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. GORE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BECKHAM, Mr. KIRBY, and Mr. CURTIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] are absent from the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I feel that it would be very unwise to try to pass this most important bill between now and the hour of 2 o'clock. I have not a doubt in my mind that there ought to be some regulation in regard to the height and area of buildings in the District of Columbia, and I have no objection to the creation of a zoning commission for the purpose of directing how buildings shall be erected, their height, and the area of the same. I think it would be very wise to create a zoning commission, as provided in the bill; but, as I read the bill, it gives a power to this commission as to the use of all classes of buildings that is far beyond reason or safety.

If the power granted to this commission as to the use of buildings for improper or unlawful purposes was all that was granted, I should have no objection to it whatever. But the bill is so broad in its scope that this commission can set aside any part of the District of Columbia for business purposes, for residential purposes, or for manufacturing purposes, or for any purpose that they may desire or think of, and anyone within a designated district who erects a building as authorized under the bill, if it should become a law, would have little to say as to how it should be used. In other words, the commission could say just what sized buildings could be built in any

district or what character of buildings. They could exclude any character or design of a building they desired to.

But that is not all. A man may build himself a home, and, being well to do, may build it in such a way and of such a size as his present financial condition would warrant. Reverses may come to the man, and he may be compelled, in order to take care of his family and support them, to rent a part of the building. The owner of a building, if this bill should become a law, would have nothing to say as to whether he could or could not rent a part of that building, for the commission may decide to so do would make it a rooming house and not a residence. This commission could say to him there can not be two families live in the house at the same time, or it would prevent the renting of any part of it. It does seem to me that if we give the commission the power to regulate the height of the building, to regulate the area of the building, to regulate the character of the building, and to map the city off in zones, that is power enough to give to any commission.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If I understood him aright a moment ago, he said that under this bill the commission could say how many people should be in a building.

Mr. SMOOT. There is nothing in the bill that would prevent them from saying that the building should be occupied by only one family, and they could say under the provisions of the bill that there should not be two families occupy any building within a designated zone.

Mr. WILLIAMS. From what language of the bill does the Senator get that idea?

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call the Senator's attention to some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish you would. I am asking for information.

Mr. SMOOT. Beginning with section 2, it reads:

That within six months after the passage of this act, and after public notice and hearing as hereinafter provided, the said commission shall divide the District of Columbia into certain districts, to be known, respectively, as height, area, and use districts, and shall adopt regulations specifying the height and area of building thereafter to be erected or altered therein, and the purposes for which buildings and premises therein may be used.

That is only one provision.

Mr. PHELAN rose.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from California to wait until I get through with this, because I want the Senator from Mississippi to consider all the use provisions of the bill at the same time. These are the regulations we authorize the commission to make as to the purpose for which buildings shall be used. There is no limitation whatever as to regulations that may be made and enforced. Then later in that same section there is the following proviso:

And provided further, That no such districts shall be established, nor shall any regulations therefor be adopted, nor shall the height, area, or use of buildings to be erected therein be prescribed until said commission has afforded persons interested an opportunity to be heard at a public hearing as hereinafter provided.

That, I think, is perfectly right, and should be there. The next provision to which I desire to refer is in section 4:

That, after the public hearings herein provided for shall have been concluded, said commission shall definitely determine the number and boundaries of the districts which it is hereby authorized and directed to establish, and shall specify the height and area of the buildings which may thereafter be erected therein, and shall prescribe the purposes for which such buildings thereafter erected may or may not be used.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not that mean that they shall specify that it shall be a residence, or a shop, or an apartment, or a hotel?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; that may be done; but it is not limited to such specifications.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the Senator any idea that they may say how many people shall be in the house?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. The regulations I have already read give them that authority. But let me continue with the other provisions. I will simply read to the Senator all that have reference to the use of buildings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Go ahead.

Mr. SMOOT. Section 8 provides:

That it shall be unlawful to use or permit the use of any building or premises or part thereof hereafter created, erected, changed, or converted wholly or partly in its use or structure until a certificate of occupancy shall have been issued by authority of said zoning commission.

In other words, no part of it could be changed for any purpose until they received the authority of the zoning commission. It is entirely in the hands of the commission, and they are to say what the building shall be used for, whether it shall be used for a residence, and if for a residence there is nothing to

prevent a regulation being made as to just how many people shall live in it. There is nothing to prevent them from saying that the kitchen of the house shall be in the basement or ground floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, it seems to be a far cry from an authority which gives the right to designate the purpose for which a building shall be used, whether as a residence, or for shopkeeping, or manufacturing, or what not, and saying that an authority is given because it is not denied; that it is given, according to the Senator's argument, to say how many people shall live in the building and whether the kitchen shall be in the basement or on the ground floor. It seems to me to be a far cry, I repeat, from what the Senator has read to the conclusion which the Senator has drawn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is nothing to prevent the zoning commission from doing exactly what I have contended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is nothing in the act to prevent a hundred things, but the act does not give any authority for them.

Mr. SMOOT. It gives the zoning commission authority to make regulations, and if you began to enumerate them—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Regulations as to height and area, and the purposes for which the building shall be used.

Mr. SMOOT. And the use of the building covers all I have said it does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purposes of the use, is all.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill reads that—

This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties: *Provided, however,* That as to all future building construction or use of premises where this act or any orders or regulations adopted under the authority thereof impose a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon height of building, or requires larger open spaces than are imposed or required by existing law, regulations, or permits, or by such easements, covenants, or agreements, the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder shall control.

Mr. President, power is given to this zoning commission over the question of the change of a building, the whole question as to what you shall do with your property, how it shall be used, and for what purposes it shall be used.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah permit an interruption?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. I served on the committee which drafted this bill. The bill primarily comes from the Fine Arts Commission. The object is simply to protect the residential and public portions of the city of Washington, and to prevent the encroachment of objectionable occupations. Where the use is referred to in the bill, it means in certain sections of the city manufacturing use, in other sections of the city residential use; but the use in the sense of limiting the number of rooms or determining the number of people who shall dwell in a building is utterly foreign to the purpose of the bill, and I do not think such a construction is conveyed in the language of the bill.

I may call the attention of the Senate to the fact that because of the absence of a law of this kind, providing for zoning districts, and regulating the height of buildings, the city of Washington is in a fair way of seriously suffering in its use of Meridian Park, which was purchased by the Government at an expense, including the improvement, of \$1,000,000; and now, because there was no restriction of this kind, a permit has been given by the District Commissioners, under the old law, to erect an apartment house which will to a considerable extent obstruct the view of people from that park, which is purely a scenic park. It was selected and improved for the very purpose of commanding a view of the city, and now, because there was no proper and adequate regulation, an apartment house is going up which will obstruct the view.

These things have brought to the minds of the people interested in the District of Columbia that there is need for such a law. So this law will give to a commission, consisting of the District Commissioners, the chairman of the Fine Arts Commission, and the United States officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, the power to zone the city and to regulate the use of buildings in the sense of providing certain parts of the city for machine shops, factories, garages, and other employments, which would be objectionable in parts set aside for residence and for public use.

I think the construction which the Senator from Utah puts upon the bill is strained, and certainly not contemplated. I do not think any fair interpretation would give such power to the newly formed commission, if the bill is passed, as to enable

them to regulate the number of rooms which shall be in a dwelling and the number of persons who may be in a house, only in so far as the height of the building controls such a subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there is no objection whatever to the greater part of the bill on my part, nor do I believe that there is a Senator or Representative who would object to the provisions of the bill as far as it relates to the height of buildings, or to the designation of the zones in which certain classes or kinds of buildings shall be erected.

Mr. CALDER. That is the very purpose of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that is the purpose of the bill, but it does not stop there. The bill proceeds and gives the zoning commission absolute power as to how a building shall be used. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggested that the bill does not specify the powers of the zoning commission. That is the danger in the bill. If it specified the powers, the commission could not go beyond the specified powers. It gives a general power of regulation of the use of buildings; and that is the only objection I have to the bill.

Mr. CALDER. I would be pleased if the Senator from Utah would suggest an amendment to accomplish the purpose he has in mind, for I am confident that the bill meets all the objections he raises. It is a meritorious bill and will be more helpful to the District of Columbia than any measure of this character we have ever enacted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that I shall offer certain amendments, which I hope the Senator will receive favorably, designed to protect a person who has already built a home, which home falls within the zoning area, so that he shall at least have some say as to what he shall do or how he shall use that home.

Mr. CALDER. The purpose of the bill is to protect people who own property in this city from encroachment by others who are taking advantage of the situation.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not objecting to that part of the bill, I will say to the Senator.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany in open executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the Secretary read sections 7 and 8, which were not read yesterday, so as to bring the Shantung amendment before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The Secretary will read the sections named.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Section VII.

"TURKEY AND BULGARIA.

"Article 155.

"Germany undertakes to recognise and accept all arrangements which the Allied and Associated Powers may make with Turkey and Bulgaria with reference to any rights, interests and privileges whatever which might be claimed by Germany or her nationals in Turkey and Bulgaria and which are not dealt with in the provisions of the present Treaty.

"Section VIII.

"SHANTUNG.

"Article 156.

"Germany renounces, in favour of Japan, all her rights, title and privileges—particularly those concerning the territory of Kiaochow, railways, mines and submarine cable—which she acquired in virtue of the Treaty concluded by her with China on March 6, 1898, and of all other arrangements relative to the Province of Shantung.

"All German rights in the Tsingtao-Tsinanfu Railway, including its branch lines, together with its subsidiary property of all kinds, stations, shops, fixed and rolling stock, mines, plant and material for the exploitation of the mines, are and remain acquired by Japan, together with all rights and privileges attaching thereto.

"The German State submarine cables from Tsingtao to Shanghai and from Tsingtao to Chefoo, with all the rights, privileges, and properties attaching thereto, are similarly acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances."

Mr. LODGE. All the amendments are the same. I merely ask that they may be read.

The next amendments of the Committee on Foreign Relations were, in article 156, line 1, after the words "in favor of," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China";

in line 9, after the words "acquired by," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China"; and, in line 13, after the words "acquired by," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think, before we pass by the amendments, that it might be possible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for the treatment of these amendments en bloc?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I shall ask that they be considered en bloc. That is the reason why I asked to have them all read.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. For the purpose of having them considered en bloc?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is the reason why I made the request to have them all read.

The Secretary read as follows:

"Article 157.

"The movable and immovable property owned by the German State in the territory of Kiaochow, as well as all the rights which Germany might claim in consequence of the works or improvements made or of the expenses incurred by her, directly or indirectly, in connection with this territory, are and remain acquired by Japan, free and clear of all charges and encumbrances."

The next amendment was, in article 157, line 5, after the words "acquired by," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China."

The Secretary read as follows:

"Article 158.

"Germany shall hand over to Japan within three months from the coming into force of the present Treaty the archives, registers, plans, title-deeds and documents of every kind, wherever they may be, relating to the administration, whether civil, military, financial, judicial or other, of the territory of Kiaochow.

"Within the same period Germany shall give particulars to Japan of all treaties, arrangements or agreements relating to the rights, title or privileges referred to in the two preceding Articles."

The next amendments were, in article 158, line 1, after the words "hand over to," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China"; and in line 6, after the words "particulars to," to strike out the word "Japan" and insert the word "China."

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the six Shantung amendments, which are substantially one, be considered as one amendment. They are all the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I believe the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] desires to address the Senate at this time upon this amendment and the league. I wish merely to say that there are several Senators who have given notice of speeches upon this amendment, and there are one or two who can not speak before next week, so that it is impossible at this moment to arrive at an agreement to vote on the amendment; but if Senators are not prepared to go on, I shall ask that the rest of the treaty be read. There is only one other amendment besides.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that if we pass over these amendments temporarily it might be possible for us to agree now upon a date when we shall take them up. I dislike very much to pass them over indefinitely. I think the Senate possibly—

Mr. LODGE. I am not asking to pass them over indefinitely. They are before the Senate now, but there are Senators to speak upon them certainly both to-day and to-morrow, and probably the next day. I was proposing to provide for the future. I do not want to waste any time, and if I can not get an agreement to vote on an early day next week, I only wanted to give notice that I should ask for the reading of the treaty to be continued beyond the amendment, so that time may not be wasted.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the request of the Senator is very desirable. My only suggestion is that there are certain committees, one in particular, which desire to leave Washington, and if we should have a definite agreement that we would return to these amendments at a certain day, say Wednesday of next week, for instance—

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President; then I ask unanimous consent that if the occasion arises—it may not arise—we may continue the reading of the treaty and return to this amendment on Wednesday of next week.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that if the reading of the treaty should be con-

cluded before that time, certainly something ought to be before the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. I think the league would still be before the Senate.

Mr. LENROOT. No; I think we are reading for amendments.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest to the Senator if we continue the reading, as I desire to do—

Mr. LENROOT. And then return to the Shantung amendment and let it be before the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. And then return to the Shantung amendment, or, continuing the reading, we shall meet with one other amendment, offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], relating to the reparation commission, and we shall also meet with the labor provisions of part 13, which, I think, are likely to give rise to a good deal of debate. I think there will be no difficulty in filling the time. I only wanted to give notice that if a moment comes when nobody is ready to go on with a discussion of the Shantung amendment we can continue the reading of the treaty, and that was understood. I have no objection to asking unanimous consent that we shall return to it Wednesday, but I do not think we will gain anything by it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It has been my purpose, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, to arrange with him, if possible, to set down the Shantung amendment for a vote on Friday, but we discovered that such an arrangement could not be made. However, as I have understood the situation, it might be possible to take up the Shantung amendment definitely on Wednesday next, and there is, so far as known, no objection to doing that.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly ready to agree to return to the Shantung amendment on Wednesday next. Of course, that is no agreement to vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is about as far as we can get, I suppose. I hope that we shall reach an early vote after Wednesday; but it seems, so far as I can learn, to be the concurrent opinion that we should on Wednesday next begin the discussion which would lead to—

Mr. LODGE. The final discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Which would lead to an early vote. I therefore ask that the unanimous-consent agreement be so framed that we shall proceed with the reading of the treaty after the Senator from Maryland and other Senators have made their addresses, and that thereafter, on Wednesday next, we shall take up for consideration the Shantung amendments en bloc, as agreed.

Mr. LENROOT. Suppose the reading of the treaty is finished on Monday, what will the Senate do in the meantime under such a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no doubt there will be ample discussion which will take us until Wednesday. As the Senator knows, I am very anxious to hasten the matter, but I find by investigation that it is impossible to get consent for any earlier date than Wednesday. I think both the Senator from Massachusetts and I have concluded that this would expedite the matter as much as possible. I doubt whether we will be able to finish the reading of the treaty by that time.

Mr. LENROOT. Why does not the Senator request that we go on with the reading of the treaty before we take up the Shantung amendment?

Mr. LODGE. That is what I was desiring to do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it is very desirable to clean it up as we go. I think we can return definitely to the Shantung amendments on Wednesday, and that will be pending until we get a vote on it. That will give everybody a reasonable time and will accommodate the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the Senator's suggestion will simply mean further delay.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. How would the Senator frame the request?

Mr. LENROOT. I would frame it so that if we do conclude the reading of the treaty before Wednesday, the Shantung amendments will be before the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should be delighted with such an arrangement, if other Senators would consent to it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Nebraska if under his statement the understanding will be that there will be no vote in the Senate on any amendments before Wednesday of next week?

Mr. LODGE. No vote on the Shantung amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There will be no vote on the Shantung amendments.

Mr. LODGE. As I said, there is another amendment with reference to the reparation commission, offered by the Senator

from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] and there is the labor council provision, which is also amended, and on which there will be a great deal of debate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. After the Shantung amendments are passed there is only one other remaining amendment, and that is on page 261.

Mr. KENYON. The labor amendment will not be taken up prior to the Shantung amendment?

Mr. LODGE. No; they are all subsequent. Everything is subsequent to the Shantung amendment. I should like to use the time in getting the treaty read, if there are no Senators ready to discuss the Shantung amendment or the league.

Mr. FLETCHER. Would it be possible to agree to vote on Wednesday, and not merely have it brought up at that time for consideration?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think so. I have made inquiry and I do not think it is possible to agree to a vote at that time. I should be very glad to do so, but I do not think it is possible. I think we can agree to return to the Shantung amendment on Wednesday. As it now stands, we can return to it at any time. My desire is to get the treaty read, which I think had better be done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit me, I will endeavor to frame a unanimous-consent agreement which possibly will meet the views of various Senators. It is that after the pending addresses are delivered, the Senate shall pass over temporarily, until next Wednesday, the Shantung amendments, to be considered then en bloc, meanwhile reading the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, if we pass it over temporarily, which is the custom with appropriation bills, the reading would continue without anything more being said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; but I am very anxious to have a certain date set, as are very many other Senators.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be very glad to have an agreement that we shall return to the Shantung amendment on Wednesday next.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suggest the following agreement: That the Senate now proceed to the reading of the treaty, subject to the addresses to be delivered here; that the Shantung amendments be passed over until next Wednesday, to be considered then en bloc, and that if, during the reading of the treaty, amendment No. 45, on page 261, is reached, that also shall be passed over for consideration subsequent and next to the Shantung amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; that is perfectly satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the agreement proposed?

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator would modify that by the further condition, that if the reading shall be concluded before next Wednesday the Shantung amendments shall be taken up upon the conclusion of the reading of the treaty, I should not object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be very glad to accept that amendment. However, I do not think there is much likelihood of it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I inquire of the Senator if he has included in his agreement any provision that we shall come to a vote on Wednesday?

Mr. LODGE. Not at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We will proceed with the reading of the treaty, and there are reasons, which have been explained to me, why it seems that a number of Senators are determined to postpone progress until that time. I am constrained to yield, because I feel that yielding now may promote progress. I do not want to urge it unnecessarily.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should be very glad to enter into an agreement that would bring this treaty to a vote and a conclusion, for I think the Senate and the country both are very desirous of reaching some conclusion. We have had a very ample debate—and I am not complaining about that fact—but there is no use, so far as I can see, of entering into an agreement concerning the consideration of the treaty and postponing the time for voting unless we are prepared to say that on that day we are going to vote.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, my only purpose was to avoid any waste of time. When those who desire now to speak upon the Shantung amendment shall have done so, if we can then pass the amendment over temporarily, in order to give an opportunity to Senators who wish to speak next week, I want to avail myself of the intervening time to have the reading of the treaty completed. As we can not reach an agreement to take a vote, that seems to me the practical thing to do.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator is trying to save time I am thoroughly in accord with him, but it is the most remarkable effort to save time that I have ever seen.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It appears to be an effort to postpone a vote without affording any subsequent opportunity to vote, and to postpone debate without giving any opportunity to bring the treaty up for consideration.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President. I have done my best, and so has the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] under existing circumstances to expedite the reading and disposition of the treaty. Every line of the treaty we read advances its consideration; for that is something that must be done; but if the Senator prefers that the time should be taken in other ways it probably will be, for there are Senators here who are going to insist that there be an opportunity for those Senators to whom I have referred to express their views upon the Shantung question before a vote is had upon it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I have said very little about this treaty, because I do not care to occupy the attention of the Senate or the time of the country. I have reached a conclusion, in my mind, as to what I am going to do; but I judge from the intimation of the leader of the other side of the Chamber that if an agreement is not made at this time to postpone consideration of the vital questions involved in the treaty we shall witness a filibuster on the part of the controlling element in the Senate to prevent action on this question.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, he must not misstate what I said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not say that the Senator made that statement.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has misstated it absolutely. I am ready to come to a vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I said that was the only conclusion I could draw from what the Senator said.

Mr. LODGE. It is an entirely erroneous conclusion from anything that I said.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If that is so, if I am mistaken in drawing that conclusion from what the Senator said, then I am sure that we will make progress by reading the treaty, because, if no extraneous matter is coming in here for the purpose of delay, of course we will proceed with the consideration of it, and, when the speeches of Senators on the Shantung question are disposed of, we will come to a vote probably before Wednesday. If there is no effort to delay, if it does not mean that we are going to have a filibuster for the purpose of delay—

Mr. LODGE. There will be no filibuster.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then the probabilities are that we will get a vote before Wednesday, and I think that a vote on this question before Wednesday is of great importance.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to interfere with the management of this treaty. I think the Senator from Nebraska has been an excellent leader for those of us who follow his side of the case, and it is not my disposition to interfere in any way with his leadership, but I do protest against the pendency of the treaty before the Senate an unnecessary length of time. I do not believe that the debate is going to affect any votes in the Senate. We have got to come to a final conclusion. If the treaty is going to be ratified, it ought to be ratified now, and, if it is going to be amended by the Senate, the sooner it goes back to Europe for further consideration the better it will be for this country. From my standpoint, I do not see that there is any justification whatever for further extended delay in the consideration of this matter. Therefore I think if we are going to enter into an agreement concerning its consideration we ought to have attached to that agreement an opportunity to vote. I am perfectly willing to enter into any agreement that will bring about a vote. I do not say that I intend to object to the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Nebraska, but I am not going to sit in my seat without protest and hear it intimated that the treaty can not be voted on because it is for the convenience of this Senator or that Senator when it is not for the convenience of the country to wait any longer on the deliberations on this floor.

Mr. LODGE. Very well, Mr. President, I withdraw my request, and the debate will continue on the Shantung amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Alabama desires to save time, the only way it can be saved now is by reading the treaty, because there is ample reason to believe that the debate will legitimately continue upon the Shantung matter. It is immaterial to me, except for the fact—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the Senator will allow me, of course if the debate continues legitimately that amount of debate will take place anyhow.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But if it is to continue illegitimately, then it is a filibuster. So it is either a filibuster or we are going to occupy time anyhow.

Mr. BORAH. We have got to read the treaty for the next two or three days or we have got to read the treaty after the vote on the Shantung amendment; it has got to be read at some time, and the simple question now is whether we will temporarily pass over the Shantung amendment and read the treaty in the meantime or whether we will debate the Shantung matter and read the treaty afterwards. It is simply a transposition of the time of reading and of debating; that is all, so far as that is concerned, and, as I understand, that was the object of the proposed agreement.

Mr. LODGE. That was the object of my request.

Mr. BORAH. Simply to transpose the time of reading and the time of the debate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hope the Senator understands that I did not rise to object, because I rarely ever object to what is being done in the Senate. I become very tired of the Senate's way of transacting business at times; I believe we should have a cloture rule and attend to business like other parliamentary bodies attend to it; but I tried that once and did not succeed and I have got to take my medicine, which I proceed every day to do.

Mr. BORAH. Every dog has his day; and the Senator may be successful later.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But I am not here to object to any agreement that the leaders of the two sides of the Chamber desire to make; I am not going to register an objection; but I merely want to express my decided opposition to any further delay in the consideration of the treaty. I believe in being courteous to any Senator on the floor of the Chamber; but when a matter of such great importance as this is pending before the Senate, with the interests of our country and of the world at stake, I think Senators should make their personal engagements conform to the business of the country and not have the great business of the country delayed to conform to their convenience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent?

Mr. FRANCE. I object.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish simply to state what my purpose was. The Senator from Nebraska and I found there would be objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. Personally I was very willing to agree to a time to vote, but we found it was impossible to get such an agreement. To my knowledge there are five Senators who are going to speak on the Shantung amendment. It seemed to me very desirable, inasmuch as we can not hope to get a vote on it before Wednesday or Thursday of next week, that if there came any gap where no Senator was ready to speak, the time should be occupied in reading the treaty, which would be distinctly advancing the case; for, of course, to get the reading of the long document out of the way—and it must be done—will be helpful. Therefore, I think, Mr. President, it is very well to leave the matter just where it is; let Senators who desire to speak on the Shantung amendment proceed, and if a point is reached where no Senator is ready to go on, then I shall ask that the reading of the treaty be continued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made to the request for unanimous consent.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that I would submit some remarks on the treaty of peace to-day; but, in view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] will address the Senate and is likely to take all the afternoon, I will postpone my remarks until to-morrow at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. FRANCE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for nearly three hours,

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has been speaking for about three hours. May I inquire of him if he can finish to-night? If not, I will move an adjournment.

Mr. FRANCE. I could conclude in about an hour. If I do not do so now, I would feel compelled to finish to-morrow, and in that case I am afraid I might interfere with other Senators who have already announced their intention to speak to-morrow.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think it would interfere with the other Senators who will speak to-morrow.

Mr. FRANCE. I shall be very glad to yield, then, with the understanding that I shall have the floor to-morrow to conclude.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, October 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, October 8, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite source of all that we see, or know, or dream, or imagine; whose love reflects itself in the stars that gild the heavens by night, in the sun which illumines the earth by day, in every blade of grass, tree or flower, in a thousand fields of grain which rustle in the breeze, in the vast storehouses of untold treasure which Thou hast hidden beneath the earth, in the sweet face of the mother who looks with ineffable love down upon the babe that she cradles in her arms, in every thought that shapes itself into a noble deed, help us as intellectual, moral, and spiritual beings to look up and worship Thee, in spirit and in truth, that our life may be well pleasing in Thy sight. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 7972. An act to improve the administration of the Postal Service in the Territory of Hawaii.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3096. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.; and

S. 2867. An act to authorize the President when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to bills of the following titles:

S. 794. An act granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects; and

S. 55. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust disputes or claims by entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States against the United States and between each other, arising from faulty surveys in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2867. An act to authorize the President when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3096. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River at or near Moncla, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 253. An act for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. SMALL was granted leave of absence, for three days, on account of public business.

RESIGNATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., October 7, 1919.

HON. FREDERICK H. GILLET,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, to take effect at once.

Respectfully,

JAMES M. MEAD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1919.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Permit me to tender my resignation, effective at once, from the Committee on Public Buildings and War Claims.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN W. RAINY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

To the Hon. FREDERICK H. GILLET.

SIR: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings, to take effect immediately.

I am,

HERBERT C. PELL, JR.

PRINTING A HOUSE DOCUMENT.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the October number of Harper's Magazine is an article by the Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON on a national budget. It is an article showing great study of this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that an article by Mr. CANNON on the budget be printed as a House document. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN moves that the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House, as follows:

Foreign Affairs: Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH of New York.

Agriculture: Mr. JOHN W. RAINY, of Illinois.

Railways and Canals: Mr. JAMES M. MEAD, of New York.

Library: Mr. HERBERT C. PELL, Jr., of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a resolution unanimously adopted by the Thirtieth Division Association of the American Expeditionary Forces recently passed at its first reunion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD for the purpose indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what subject did they resolve?

Mr. KITCHIN. The bonus and other bills before Congress proposing aid to the soldiers. It will be enlightening to many of us who are tumbling over each other to do something to catch "the soldier vote."

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas we are informed that certain bills have been introduced in the Congress of the United States and are now there being considered, which bills provide the payment of bonuses of one kind or another to members of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who served therein during the late World War; and

Whereas we believe that these bills have for their object the commercialization of the patriotism of the young men and women who served their country during the emergency both at home and overseas, and further seek to make out of the former members of the American Army, Navy, and Marine Corps a football for scheming politicians: Now, therefore, in order to make plain the views of the Thirtieth Division Association of the American Expeditionary Forces, now holding its first reunion, be it, and it is hereby

Resolved, That, in our opinion, the Congress of the United States, through the War Risk Insurance Bureau, makes reasonable provision for the beneficiaries of our fallen comrades, and it is our desire that this provision be continued.

Second. That we indorse and approve the policy of the Government of the United States to continue the war-risk insurance for those soldiers who have returned and been discharged the service.

Third. That we believe it to be the duty of the Government of the United States to make ample provision to care for and maintain in comfort those of our comrades who have been permanently disabled and are rendered helpless by reason of wounds or injuries received in the service.

Fourth. That we believe it to be the duty of the Government of the United States to render aid to and make reasonable provision for those of our comrades who have been partially disabled by wounds or injuries received in the service.

Fifth. That we believe the Government of the United States owes no duty to give bonuses or other financial aid to those of us who have returned to our homes unwounded and uninjured, except that it should give preference in civil and public employment to those of us who seek such employment and are fitted for the same.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. To-day is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the committees.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (when the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was called). Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 9692.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9692) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereof, and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the bill is an amendment which has been reported to the committee by a subcommittee which had it in charge—

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the bill ought to be read.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Very well; I have no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9692) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereof; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereof; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. (a) That no vessel of 100 tons gross and upward, except those navigating rivers exclusively and the smaller inland lakes and except as provided in section 4516 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by section 1 of this act, shall be permitted to depart from any port of the United States unless she has on board a crew not less than 75 per cent of which, in each department thereof, are able to understand any order given by the officers of such vessel, nor unless 40 per cent in the first year, 45 per cent in the second year, 50 per cent in the third year, 55 per cent in the fourth year after the passage of this amendment, and thereafter 65 per cent of her deck crew, exclusive of licensed officers and apprentices, are of a rating not less than able seaman.

"(b) The following persons shall be rated and certificated able seaman by any board of local inspectors upon passing an examination under rules to be prescribed by the Department of Commerce as to eyesight, hearing, and physical condition:

"(1) Citizens of the United States of 19 years of age or upward who have graduated from any of the training ships of the recruiting service of the United States Shipping Board, or from school ships approved by and conducted under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, or who have passed the final examinations given by such recruiting service, and have had nine months' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes on a vessel or vessels to which this section applies, including decked fishing vessels, naval vessels, Coast Guard vessels, lighthouse vessels, Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, and vessels of the Bureau of Fisheries.

"(2) Aliens and citizens of the United States not complying with the foregoing requirements of 19 years of age or upward, who have had at least three years' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes on the aforesaid classes of vessels, or, if the rating is for service on the Great Lakes or on the smaller lakes, bays, and sounds, who have had at least 18 months' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes or on the smaller lakes, bays, and sounds on the aforesaid classes of vessels: *Provided*, That upon a further examination under rules prescribed by the Department of Commerce, as to knowledge of the duties of seaman-ship, any person of the classes named in this subsection found competent therein, and who has qualified as to eyesight, hearing, and physical condition, may be rated an able seaman after having served on deck 12 months at sea or on the Great Lakes; but aliens examined and rated able seamen under this proviso shall not in any case compose more than one-fourth of the number of able seamen required by this section to be shipped or employed upon any vessel.

"(c) Each board of local inspectors shall keep a complete record of all certificates of service issued by it and to whom issued, and shall keep on file the affidavits upon which such certificates were issued.

"(d) No clearance shall be given to any vessel failing to comply with the provisions of this section. The collector of customs may on his own motion cause a muster of the crew of any vessel to be made to determine whether this section is being complied with, and shall cause such muster to be made upon the sworn information of any reputable citizens of the United States, filed with him at least six hours before the vessel departs or is scheduled to depart, setting forth that this section is not being complied with. Any person who knowingly makes a false affidavit for such purpose is guilty of perjury, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$500 or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"(e) Any violation of any provision of this section by the owner, master, or officer in charge of the vessel shall subject the owner of such vessel to a penalty of not less than \$100 and not more than \$500.

"(f) The Secretary of Commerce shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and nothing herein shall be held or construed to prevent the Board of Supervising Inspectors, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, from making rules and regulations authorized by law as to vessels excluded from the operation of this section."

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, a very large number of Members have asked opportunity to speak on this bill in general debate, and I would like to ask unanimous consent for three hours' general debate instead of two hours, as provided for by the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate fixed by the rule of two hours be extended to three hours. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what these speeches will be about?

Mr. ROWE. Entirely on this bill. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, both the Democratic side and the Republican side, decided that this was an important measure, and they would like properly to discuss it before the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, why does it take three hours to discuss a bill like that?

Mr. ROWE. Well, in the first place, it is an amendment to the seamen's act, on one of the most important sections of the seamen's act, and it will require a good deal of general discussion. There is really only one section to it, so that we can not get in under the five-minute rule very well.

The SPEAKER. There is no five-minute rule, the Chair will state.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If time is to be devoted to harangues of a miscellaneous nature, I am opposed to it. If it is going to be confined to the bill, as I do not know anything about the bill, I do not object to it.

Mr. ROWE. I shall ask that it be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether he is going to have anybody here to hear the debate? There are probably about 45 or 50 Members, not over that, here now. If there is going to be an audience here to hear it, whereby some good may be accomplished, why, then, the time of the House will be well taken up.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas that he can probably regulate that better than the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rowe].

Mr. BLANTON. I am not so facetious in that regard as probably the gentleman imagines.

Mr. GARRETT. Is it the gentleman's purpose to ask that we may consider the bill as under the five-minute rule for amendment?

Mr. ROWE. We can not do it—

Mr. GARD. You can by unanimous consent.

Mr. ROWE. I think it would be well to do it. I believe if we get the extra hour for the general discussion we can complete the bill to-day. I want to do so.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to suggest that there is only one section in the bill. It is not at all complicated. Amendments may be offered to that one section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy time on the bill. It has been thoroughly considered by the subcommittee that has had it in charge, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rowe] is the chairman of that subcommittee. I yield him 20 minutes of time.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the seamen's act became a law on March 4, 1915, and there have been practically no amendments made to that act since it was passed.

During the last four years the world has witnessed a great upheaval, and in no department of business or government has the upheaval been so great as in the merchant marine of the world. In June, 1914, before the war broke out in Europe, the world had 49,000,000 gross tons of shipping. During the four years, or nearly five years, which have elapsed since that time, many merchant vessels have been destroyed, but because of the immense building program of the United States and Japan, and because of England's desperate effort to keep her merchant ships upon the seas, there has been no great change in the merchant tonnage of the world. The fact is that to-day it exceeds the tonnage of 1914, as according to Lloyd's, recently issued, the world had in June, 1919, 50,919,000 gross tons of merchant vessels. During this time there has been an immense increase in the merchant tonnage of the United States. When the war broke out in 1914 we had scarcely 2,000,000 gross tons of overseas shipping. We have now in excess of 8,000,000 gross tons of overseas shipping.

This has been accomplished, so far as the United States is concerned, by an immense building program, appropriated for by Congress and carried out by the Shipping Board. For instance, we increased considerably over 4,000,000 tons, to be accurate, 4,187,600 tons, in the year ending August 31, 1919.

The question came to your Merchant Marine Committee in the early part of this session, as it did last year, as to how the United States were to supply the seamen necessary to operate their vessels, now and in the future. At the time of the

passage of the seamen's act about 43 per cent of the seamen on American vessels were American citizens. Of this number 65,196 were American born and 29,965 were foreign born. In the four years which have elapsed since that act went into effect there has been a great change as to the number of American citizens who are native born that have gone to the seas. We have increased from 65,196 to 97,160 the number of seamen on American ships that are native born. We have decreased in the number of naturalized citizens from 29,900 to 24,600.

It is interesting also to note that in 1914, prior to the breaking out of the war in Europe, 47 per cent of the seamen on American ships were American citizens. The following year it had dropped to 43 per cent; in 1916 it was 43 per cent; in 1917 it had dropped to 42 per cent; in 1918, to 41 per cent. Now, it has again gone back to the place it was in 1914, namely, 47 per cent.

How did we accomplish that? How were we able to find the seamen to supply the ships of the American merchant marine which in so brief a period jumped from 2,000,000 gross tons to 8,000,000 gross tons in the overseas trade? The Shipping Board found after the war broke out in Europe that we were short of officers, and they created a school, headed by a Mr. Howard, of Boston, to find officers for the merchant marine. And he started about it in a very sensible way. Being accustomed to the sea and, especially to the coastwise business of the merchant marine, and being a New Englander, he realized that the only men that had been sufficiently trained for this work and that were not already in the overseas trade, were on the fishing vessels along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, and just a few who had gone into the other lines of business and had left the merchant marine, and were living on the land. He canvassed the entire Atlantic and Pacific coasts for men who had had sufficient time at sea and who could in a brief time qualify as officers on steam vessels. These were found almost entirely on sailboats. In that way they gathered a sufficient number to make the officers on the ships operated by the merchant marine. Then there came a very urgent call for seamen, and they found these on land, and they trained these by establishing training schools, the main school at Boston, with branches all along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, for the training of men, chiefly on board training ships, and in two or three months after they had gone there and taken their first lessons they were put on board merchant vessels as common seamen. In this way the schools established by the Shipping Board have furnished 27,000 men for our merchant ships, about 9,000 of these for the deck, about 9,000 for the stewards' department, and about the same number for the engine room. These men have made good.

Mr. ALEXANDER. By the engine rooms, the gentleman means the firing rooms?

Mr. ROWE. The firing rooms; the firemen's department.

Under the seamen's act, section 13, practically all of the able-bodied seamen must reach the position and get their certificate after three years' service at sea. I say practically all, because in the seamen's act there was a provision for a shorter cut, namely, after service on shipboard for one year they could take an examination given under the direction of the Department of Commerce and become thereby able seamen, but the facts show that but very few have come in in that way, and practically all of those came from the two training ships, one at Boston and one at New York, and they were for the most part sailors who failed to pass the officers' examination and become third mates, and were given a certificate as able seamen and allowed to go to sea.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROWE. I do.

Mr. HICKS. There seems to be some misunderstanding or some error in the reports that I have in my possession in regard to the tonnage of American ships. In the gentleman's own testimony before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries on the 3d day of September he mentioned that the total gross tonnage of the United States is 8,000,000 tons, and in Lloyd's Register, under date of June 30, that tonnage is given as over 10,700,000. Where is the discrepancy? They are both dealing in gross tons, as I understand, and yet here is a discrepancy of nearly 3,000,000 gross tons.

Mr. ROWE. I think the gentleman is mistaken as to my testimony. The United States tonnage is to-day something over 10,000,000 tons. There is 8,000,000 tons engaged in the overseas trade.

Mr. HICKS. Then the gentleman's figures do not include the coastwise trade?

Mr. ROWE. They do not include the coastwise trade or the trade on the Great Lakes.

Mr. HICKS. My figures of 10,700,000 tons do not include the Great Lakes trade, but do include the coastwise trade, I imagine, for that is deep-sea navigation.

Mr. ROWE. That is correct. The deep-sea tonnage is something between 10,000,000 and 11,000,000.

Mr. HICKS. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. ROWE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HICKS. Looking over this Lloyd's Register, as I gather it, there are only two nations which during the war have increased their seagoing tonnage at all, and they are Japan and the United States. Japan has increased her seagoing tonnage by about 617,000 tons, while America has increased its seagoing tonnage by 7,812,000 tons. Is that about correct, as the gentleman understands it?

Mr. ROWE. That is about correct.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman allow me to put in as a part of my question to him some figures that I have prepared here?

Mr. ROWE. I have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The caption of the bill before us among other things, provides that one of its purposes is "to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to promote safety at sea?"

Mr. ROWE. No. The original seamen's act did that.

Mr. BLANTON. But the caption of this bill so states, and this bill has something to do with the original seamen's act?

Mr. ROWE. Yes; but this only amends section 13. It has nothing to do with imprisonment at sea.

Mr. BLANTON. That was merely a preamble to the question I was going to ask the gentleman. The purpose of having a merchant marine is, of course, to benefit our Government and to promote its business prospects, I take it?

Mr. ROWE. That is the object of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Now, may I ask the gentleman whether, should this Government at any time, in time of war or in peace time or during the time of reconstruction, see fit to send a cargo, whatever it might consist of, to a certain port, we would be interested and the gentleman's committee would be interested in seeing that that cargo was sent there expeditiously and safely? We would be, would we not?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. May I call the gentleman's attention to a circular letter which, I presume, by reason of its address has come to every Member of Congress this morning in the mail? It came to my office, and by its form of address I presume it came to every other office. It is dated "Seattle, Wash., October 2," and it is addressed "to the honorable Members of Congress of the United States, Senators and Representatives, Washington, D. C." Without reading this whole letter, I may say that it states that the longshoremen of Seattle, with the approval of the Central Labor Council of Seattle, deemed it advisable and upon their own counsel absolutely refused to handle certain supplies and armament and ammunition then held in Seattle for shipment to Russia, because they did not deem it advisable to send them to Russia. Now, may I ask the gentleman, if that state of affairs does exist in this Nation, and it should occur that this Government should see fit to send certain munitions and supplies to Russia for the protection of American interests there, whether we are at war with Russia or not, and I take it that the Government has the right to protect our rights in Russia, if we have rights there, and while I do not see the necessity of keeping soldiers there, yet if the Government says it is necessary I am not going to question the matter until I find out that the Government is wrong, and any men or combination of men attempt to thwart the action of the Government, may I ask the gentleman, should not your committee take certain steps, if steps are necessary, to see to it that when the Government deems it necessary to send munitions to Russia, no set of individuals, especially American citizens, can stop that shipment by their own act? Is not that a proper question for the gentleman's committee to take into consideration at this time?

Mr. ROWE. I think without question that the United States Congress should take up such matters.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think if the gentleman will examine the circular he will find that those arms are not being sent by the Government of the United States. I have read it.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. CLEARY. The subject matter that the gentleman is dealing with is the commerce of the United States?

Mr. ROWE. It is.

Mr. CLEARY. Therefore it is not connected with the matter that the gentleman from Texas refers to. The tonnage the gentleman from New York alludes to includes coastwise tonnage. Of course, seagoing tonnage is another thing. Of course, lots of barges are counted as American tonnage, but it is not seagoing tonnage. I wish to get that straight, that the gentleman is not talking about anything except the merchant marine and the commerce of the United States.

Mr. ROWE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for 10 minutes more?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. HADLEY. Has the gentleman information as to the shortage of seamen to man our merchant vessels for its completed program?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. HADLEY. Is it the intention of the gentleman to discuss that?

Mr. ROWE. There is a great difference of opinion as to that. The labor organizations said there were ample. The shippers and the Shipping Board said they had great difficulty in finding the necessary number of seamen, and I thought the House would use its good judgment to-day, and when they realized that the American oversea business had increased from 2,000,000 tons to 8,000,000 in four years, they would appreciate the fact that it required more seamen than we have; and when they go further than that fact and realize that the Shipping Board has a plan and has in course of construction enough more ships so that by the end of next year we will have in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 tons, the Members of this House ought to realize that we must have more seamen.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HULINGS. Does the gentleman think that under the seamen's act, under our maritime laws, it is possible at all that we could enter into competition with the world in the merchant marine?

Mr. ROWE. I think it is possible. I think it is not only possible, but I believe we are going to do it.

Mr. HULINGS. But when you have to pay two or three times as much in this country for wages as Japan does—

Mr. ROWE. I do not care to go into the question of wages, but I will just answer the gentleman's question. England to-day is paying almost the same wages that we are. England was paying the same wages until the recent raise caused by a strike along the Atlantic coast, but now we are paying about \$10 a month more to each seaman, or between \$10 and \$15 a month more than the English rates. The English rates are very largely followed by Norway, Italy, and France. The seamen of Japan are not yet receiving the same wages that are paid in the United States, but their wages have more than doubled, and will in a short time go higher.

Mr. HULINGS. At the same time, the cost of keeping the seamen aboard our ships, and the quarters furnished them, and all that, is twice as much as under the English rule.

Mr. ROWE. I can only say in answer to that that the merchantmen, the men who own the ships on the Atlantic and Pacific coast seaboard, say that they can compete with England.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. Is it correct that the United States has been selling some tonnage? And if so, why?

Mr. ROWE. We have a large surplus of small ships ranging from 3,000 to 4,000 tons. We have also a large surplus of wooden vessels. The ones that have been sold so far to the foreign trade have been of the kind that we could not use in our merchant marine.

Mr. KINKAID. It is not in contemplation, then, that the United States will dispose of any ships that we can make serviceable in a complete, well-rounded-out merchant marine?

Mr. ROWE. No; it is not. There is a bill before our committee, we have had hearings upon it, and the plan of the Shipping Board is to sell only those that are surplus vessels to foreigners, and to sell to Americans all ships which can be used in our trade.

Mr. KINKAID. I have felt very much concern about this, because I feel that now is the time, if ever, for America to build up a merchant marine.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I will.

Mr. HICKS. There have been many rumors circulated in regard to the Shipping Board having under contemplation the construction of two 50,000-ton ships. The Scientific American has gone so far as to put sketches of these vessels in its paper. I never have been able to substantiate the rumor. Can the gentleman enlighten me?

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman has the right word; it is pure rumor. The Shipping Board has done nothing about it. The people who have proposed it have done nothing about it, and Congress has appropriated no money for them.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. There have been rumors circulated that the wooden ships which the Shipping Board has been selling are not fit for service.

Mr. ROWE. That is not entirely true; part of them are excellent ships. Of course, nearly all of them have been built under war conditions, and are good when you take that into consideration. Many of them have been sold at very good prices.

Mr. CLEARY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I will.

Mr. CLEARY. Is it not true that the Government is disposing of the smaller vessels because it is unprofitable for the Government to run that kind of a vessel?

Mr. ROWE. That is true.

Mr. CLEARY. And as far as certain ports of the country go, the vessels are properly built, but the Government has built some ships that it would not be profitable to use as seagoing vessels, but might be profitable as coastwise vessels, and so they are disposing of the vessels that would be unprofitable in whole or in part.

Mr. ROWE. That is so. We have more than we can use of the Lake type.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What specific amendment is there in the proposed bill that differs—

Mr. ROWE. If the gentleman will pardon me, in a few minutes I will explain the bill itself. On page 2 of the bill you will find the first 8 or 9 lines are exactly like the present law. In other words, we have made no change in the 75 per cent of the crew who must understand any order given by its officers. Your Committee on the Merchant Marine feel that that is essential to the operation of any merchant marine vessel that the orders given by the officers should at least be understood by 75 per cent of the sailors.

In 1915, after the seamen's act went into operation, vessels were required during the first year to have 40 per cent, the second year 45 per cent, the third year 50 per cent, the fourth year 55 per cent, and thereafter 65 per cent of the deck crew certified able seamen. The act has been so long in operation that at the present time if the act were enforced, which it can not be, or else we would have to take a great many ships off the sea, 55 per cent would have to be able seamen. With reference to that matter we have changed the percentage, and we have by this amendment turned back four years and begin again with 40 per cent.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROWE. I ask for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. The committee felt that if 40 per cent able seamen was ample in 1915, it was good at this time. The Merchant Marine Committee felt that they ought not to go lower than that. Now, as a matter of fact during all this war we have been operating our ships contrary to these provisions, and we had to. Men were put on board ships in two months, some of them immediately as soon as they applied, and went to work in the operation of the vessels. But we found that splendid seamen, as good as any able seamen, could be made of some of them in six months, and very much of the testimony was to that effect. This bill, however, while originally calling for six months, has been changed by the committee to nine months. The present law requires a service of three years before a common seaman can be an able seaman. You can not get American boys to go into the merchant marine if they are to be held three years in service before they can be able seamen. The difference in wages is great, and they can not be held to do the same job over and over again at the same wage, especially if his time is largely spent in scrubbing the decks. Able seamen receive \$85 and keep per month and ordinary seamen \$65 per month.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries claim that this is an act to bring the American boy into the merchant

marine, and in subsection 1 you will see that this nine-months provision applies only to American boys, citizens of the United States. The very first words of subsection 1 show that:

(1) Citizens of the United States of 19 years of age or upward who have graduated from any of the training ships of the recruiting service of the United States Shipping Board, or from school ships approved by and conducted under rules prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce, or who have passed the final examinations given by such recruiting service, and have had nine months' service on deck at sea or on the Great Lakes on a vessel or vessels to which this section applies, including decked fishing vessels, naval vessels, Coast Guard vessels, lighthouse vessels, Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels, and vessels of the Bureau of Fisheries.

That is the meat of this bill. We found that the boys can do the work. The man who had charge of the work in the Navy appeared before our committee. He said that they trained their officers in six months, that they put them in very important places in seven months, and that they made good, and the man who testified to it is the governor of the Sailors' Snug Harbor in New York. He acted for the Navy during the time, and he said he had not believed it was possible to take a man off the farm and in seven months make an officer of him, an ensign able to do his full part in the Navy of the United States, but that they did it, and he said better men were never sent to sea.

Mr. CLEARY. Does not the gentleman think that the reason for having such long service in the past was because it required a great deal more practice and a great deal more efficiency and a great deal more time to acquire it on a sailing ship, where a man had to climb masts and set sails and do things of that kind, than are now required on steamships? I think the long period of apprenticeship was instituted at the time when commerce was principally carried on the ocean by sailing vessels.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman is very familiar with the American merchant marine, having spent his life in it, and he can answer better than I can, but undoubtedly the operation of a sailing vessel was very much more difficult than the operation of a steam vessel.

Mr. CLEARY. I simply wanted to draw out that fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ROWE. I will take two minutes more, if the gentleman will allow me.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. ROWE. Subsection 2 is the present existing law. It has been rewritten by our committee, but it still provides that anybody who does not care to take advantage of subsection 1 can come in under the three-year provision, or if a man wishes to try the examination given by the Secretary of Commerce he can, if he passes, come in under the one-year limit, if he has the physical qualifications and the necessary knowledge of seamanship. So we have not cut off the right, either of an American citizen or of a foreign-born man, to come under the three-year provision into our American merchant marine. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] desire to use any of his time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] such time as he desires.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I should like 10 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which I am not opposing, and in large measure I agree with it, and I am making this statement only in order to present my complete attitude in the matter.

I think it is absolutely essential that our Government should adopt as far as possible wise, sound, and efficient policies for the upbuilding and maintenance of our merchant marine. We have now the seamen's act, which was passed in 1915, which undertook to establish at least the basis of a policy for the upbuilding of our merchant marine. I noted the question asked by Gen. HULINGS a few moments ago of the gentleman then addressing the House [Mr. ROWE] as to whether or not it was possible for us to maintain a competitive merchant marine, under the seamen's bill and our laws, on account of the high wages which we had to pay to our seamen. I refer to the seamen's act with a great deal of pride, because it was attacked when it was passed as being so excessively restrictive and burdensome that it would destroy our merchant marine. The greatest feature of the attack on the bill was that it provided certain requirements as to language qualifications. It provided that 75 per cent of the members of the crews should be able to understand the language of the officers sufficiently to comprehend the orders of the officers. The shipowners denounced that provision, saying that under it they could not operate their ships at all because they could not employ non-English-speaking crews. One great manager of a line on the

Pacific Ocean, the Pacific Mail Steamship Co., when he sold some of his large vessels, said he did it on account of the language test of the seamen's bill; that he could not compete with the Japanese on the Pacific Ocean if his crews had to be able to understand the language of the officers; that that would deprive him of the privilege of employing Chinese and Japanese labor as members of his crew. I knew, as a matter of fact, that that was a pretense, because that same man had testified before our committee that 90 per cent of his Chinese crews did understand the orders of the officers, and that, as a matter of fact, it would be a shame to our Nation to permit a policy to be continued under which our ships could be operated with crews more than 25 per cent of whom could not understand the language of the officers. The safety of life at sea demanded that at least 75 per cent of ships' crews should be able to understand orders. Then it was contended that we could not compete because of the excessive wages we paid. That is the point made here to-day by Gen. HULINGS, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. That may have been in a measure true before the enactment of the seamen's bill. But the seamen's bill equalized the wages of seamen on all ships sailing out of American ports. Briefly, I may explain how it did it.

The seamen's bill, for the first time in human history, gave to the seamen the same freedom that the laborer on land has. In that bill we said that, notwithstanding a seaman had signed articles of agreement in Liverpool or Naples binding him at a low wage for a round-trip voyage, under which he bound himself to return with the ship and under which by our treaties with foreign nations if he came to the coast of America and deserted his ship he could be arrested as a criminal and put back on board the ship, we would set him free. And we provided that in case of such desertion he could not be arrested. Under the old practice and policy of arresting deserting seamen when they quit their vessels in our ports and putting them back in charge of their officers on the vessel, it is true that seamen of other nations worked for less wages than the seamen of the United States, but under the operation of the seamen's act passed in 1915 the evidence is unanimous, without dissent, that the wages paid on American vessels are paid likewise on British vessels trading in American ports or on Swedish and Norwegian vessels for the simple reason that if a British vessel engages its crew in Liverpool at a less price than that at which that crew could be obtained in New York, when the crew gets to New York it quits the vessel, and unless the British master pays them the American wage, they will not return.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I interrupt only because by silence I do not want to seem to consent to the accuracy of that statement, and if the gentleman will permit me, I have here a statement from the Shipping Board under date of August 25, which shows that the average monthly wage expense—

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I think I shall come to what the gentleman is about to say in a moment.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Is very considerable more than that of British vessels.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. How much more?

Mr. WHITE of Maine. On a monthly wage expense on an American vessel of \$5,400, the British wage scale is almost \$1,600 less.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The gentleman may be right about that particular vessel at that particular time, but witnesses also stated that was a recent raise by the American authorities and that the English always followed up the American raise. Prior to the last raise made in American wages, which was about August 1 this year, the wages were practically the same, and I have well-authenticated figures showing that for many months prior to that time wages on English and American vessels were the same. When we raise our scale the English vessel must follow after, as must also the Norwegian and the Swedish vessels.

Mr. HICKS. Has that always been the case, that the English merchant shipowner would follow in his wages the American shipowner?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Not until after we passed the seamen's act.

Mr. HICKS. Was it so before we passed the seamen's act?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. That is what I am trying to get into the heads of Members who have not studied the question. Before we passed the seamen's act, when an English vessel came to the American coast, the seaman engaged at \$10 a month or \$20 a month less than the wages paid ours if he deserted, would be arrested and put back on board the English vessel, but the seamen's bill abolished arrest and imprisonment for desertion.

on ships, with the consent of even the shipowners, who did not dare to oppose it, and after that act, which has been called the charter of liberty of the seamen, the wages of foreign vessels trading in the United States ports gradually approached and finally came up to the wages paid on American vessels, and for this reason: You can not work two freemen side by side with absolute freedom and equal attainments at different rates of wages. They will demand the same rate of wage.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar, of course, with that provision of the seamen's act to which the gentleman referred, but would the gentleman give me the figures as to how many men have been arrested or would have been arrested if the seamen's act had not been passed?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I do not want to go extensively into that, because when we discussed another law which passed this House a short time ago I made a speech and went into it quite extensively; but, generally, the fact is simply this, that the wages of the seamen of other nations trading between our ports and their ports must gradually come up to the wages of the American seamen, and they have done it. When we raise our seamen's wages from time to time, under the influence of the rising cost of things, the wages of the seamen of other vessels than American are gradually raised, because if they are trading in the United States ports and they do not get the raise they quit their vessels and seek employment in our vessels.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The gentleman is taking up my time on matters that are not involved in the present bill. I was induced to go into this matter because Gen. HULLINGS, under the old idea that we could not compete on account of higher wages in this country, asked whether there was any chance of our merchant vessels competing with the foreign trade.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to interpolate a remark there? I think I am disposed to agree with the gentleman that there has been a tendency since the seamen's law was passed for wages to equalize.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. To approximate, at least.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I simply meant to suggest that I do not think the European wage has as yet reached the American standard, and I do not believe, myself, it ever will, although there has been that tendency.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Six months ago I had statistical information from Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, and at that time the wages paid on outgoing vessels of foreign nations, at least including the English and the Norwegian and one or two other nations, that had a great many ships, were the same, because they had been brought up to our wage standard by the privilege their seamen had of abandoning their vessels without arrest. The foreign ships had to pay the same wage to retain their crews. It is the unanimous testimony before our committee that the wages of seamen are determined not by the flag, but by the port in which they are hired. Consequently, if an English ship in New York has to have a seaman, it must pay New York wages, and when an English ship came into the port of New York after the passage of this act, with seamen engaged at lower wages than prevailed in New York, those seamen left the vessel and sought employment where they could get New York wages. Therefore, in order to hold their seamen the English vessels had to come to the American wage, and, therefore, under the operation of that law the wage cost of operating vessels is practically the same. Every other cost is exactly the same. The American vessel buys its material in whatever port it does at the market price, and everything, then, is equalized, wages and material for the operation of an American and English vessel. To make this plainer, if possible, let me read you from the testimony of Andrew Furuseth, president of the American Seaman's Union, before our committee on September 10, this year:

Mr. FURUSETH. But let me speak very soberly on the question, as soberly as I can. The war began in August, 1914. The seaman's act did not come into operation until November 4, 1915, in American ships. So that meant one year and about four months. Now, it did not get into operation in foreign vessels until the 1st of August, 1916. So that the war had been in operation for two years before the seaman's act came into operation on foreign vessels coming to the United States. There was not one cent's increase in the foreign seamen's wages during the war until the 1st of August.

The CHAIRMAN. What year?

Mr. FURUSETH. 1916, when our wages, the wages of the American seamen, were increased 50 per cent in the spring of 1916—in the month of March or April, I do not remember exactly the time. Now, then, the men on board foreign vessels could not quit those vessels without being arrested and put back again. The result was that the wages of those foreign seamen remained just where they were until

the men were free to quit. The last crowd that was arrested for quitting a vessel was a crowd on an English vessel down at Norfolk or Newport News. I do not remember the name of it. We thought that the seamen's act was going into operation on the 1st of July, because that would give the full 15 months necessary, and the men thought they had a right to leave the vessel after July 1. Some of them left and they simply hired other men and paid the wages of the port. Then an English master arrested the men in Newport News or down in that part of the country, and took them before the court to have them put back on board the ship. The lawyer whom we hired then sent a communication to the department here, or had the court do it, I think, and a definite report came back that the law would be in full operation after August 1. They could not get the vessel to sea before August 1, so they had to pay the men off, and they paid them on August 7. You know, under ordinary circumstances, they would not have paid them off, but as it was then they had to pay them off and hire another crew at the American wages, and this particular crew was going to receive American wages. Since that time, in 1917, the wages increased to \$60 a month, and they followed. You have that here in this publication—the matter that has been published by the department—

Mr. LEBACH. Wages paid to seamen, Committee on Commerce of the Senate?

Mr. FURUSETH. Yes; that is it. Now, that shows exactly how the wages have been following. Since that time, in 1918, the Shipping Board made the wages \$75 and the foreign vessels followed it. And what is more—

Mr. ROWE. Don't you understand they have not yet followed it?

Mr. FURUSETH. On the very contrary, they pay \$75 a month out of England now, and have been doing so for 18 months.

Mr. ROWE. You mean able-bodied?

Mr. FURUSETH. Yes; able-bodied.

Mr. ROWE. The others have not reached that yet?

Mr. FURUSETH. Yes; they have reached that.

Mr. ROWE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. FURUSETH. They are doing it out of Norway; they are doing it out of Sweden; they are doing it out of Denmark.

Mr. HARDY. As I understand, foreign vessels entering and leaving United States ports have had to take up every progress the American sailor has had?

Mr. FURUSETH. Absolutely. And what is more, they have to take up our progress as to the standards. When I was in Norway, they were discussing in Norway the taking up of our standard of efficiency. That had been recommended by the commission some years before. They were discussing taking up the standard of efficiency that had been made the law in America.

But there is one thing that has not been equalized, and that is the cost of the ship that flies the American flag. So long as we retain that handicap and try to use only American-built ships under the American flag, that long will our ships cost more, and we will be unable to compete.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield very briefly there?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Let me get through, and then if I have time I will yield.

Mr. HUSTED. It is in connection with what the gentleman has been talking about and it is a very short question.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Only a very short question.

Mr. HUSTED. I just wanted to ask the gentleman whether the wages of British ships that do not touch American ports, but with which American ships come in competition, are affected by the wages paid by British ships which do touch American ports?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Frankly, we can not affect that except that men engaged in the same trade are likely, even in London, to require the same wages. That would affect the wages paid by England in other trades indirectly, but not directly.

Mr. HUSTED. As a matter of fact, are wages of seamen on British ships that do not touch American ports considerably lower than the wages of seamen on British ships that do touch at American ports?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I do not know, but I know, for instance—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I asked Mr. Furuseth that question on page 74 of the hearings.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Right at that point: I can understand very well, and always have understood, how we could maintain a uniform standard of wages on vessels entering our ports from foreign ports, but our competition must be in the world's trade. Now the English, Scandinavian, and German vessels are competing with us in the foreign trade, and what is the standard of wages of Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries as compared with wages on our vessels in other trades where we are competing with them and will have to continue to compete with them?

Mr. FURUSETH. On English vessels out of England—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Say for South America.

Mr. FURUSETH. Going to South America, to Bolivia, or to East India, they pay exactly the same wages as when they are going to New York. The wage out of England is made the American wage rate. The wage out of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, is the American wage rate, wherever their vessels are going to-day.

That is the information that he gives.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I thank the gentleman for that. I did not recall that that question had been asked, but you see how reasonable it is, for an Englishman in Liverpool employing sailors would hardly be able to employ them at one rate going to New York and another rate going to Valparaiso and gradu-

ally the effect would naturally be as stated by the witness, and all seamen going out of Liverpool would be paid the same wages. In addition to that our great purpose is not at the present time to engage in the commerce of the world which does not touch United States ports, but we want to be able to maintain our merchant marine in order to carry our cheap merchandise between ourselves and all foreign nations, and if we can make it so that the wages of the seamen on vessels plying between American ports and foreign ports are the same on the American ship as on the foreign ship, then we can compete in American commerce. Whether we shall be enabled to engage in commerce between Asia and Africa or Asia and Europe I do not know, but I do know prior to the time of the Great War between the States the American shipowners sailed upon the seas to all ports and even then America was paying better wages than the balance of the world, and I do know that the English, with a higher standard of wages than the Italians or the Frenchmen or any European nation, have sailed all the seas; and I do know, even if we had to pay a little bit more in wages than they, that our seamen are, and have always proven themselves, better seamen by virtue of the ingenuity and talent of the American people, and we can compete under the slight handicap of better wages. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. No. I desire to finish this and then, if I have time, I will yield. Now, in regard to policy. We adopted the policy set forth in the seamen's bill in 1915, and under it the percentage of American citizens taking service on ships has greatly increased. Before that act only about 8 or 9 per cent of our seamen were American citizens; now over 40 per cent are citizens of the United States.

Now, we provided a scale of skill that should apply to a deck crew. In 1915 we provided that the first year after the passage of that act 40 per cent of the deck crew should be able seamen. The next year after that 45, and the next year 50, and the next year 55, and then 60, and after that 65 per cent. Why? Because for safety of life at sea it was deemed necessary that a good percentage of the crew on the deck of a vessel on the ocean ought to be skilled seamen. A great question was raised as to how long it took to make a skilled seaman—that is, an A. B. We thrashed that question out in 1915. We determined ordinarily that it took three years on board a vessel to make a man a skilled seaman on the high seas, and that on the Lakes 18 months would do it. But we knew there were exceptionally bright characters, so we put it in that law that a man having a certificate of graduation from certain schools might upon examination be given a certificate as A. B. after one year's service on deck at sea, and on the Great Lakes—that is, where he had been educated and had gone through a school—and we also provided still further that especially bright individuals, if they had been at sea for one year, qualified physically, and stood the examination provided by the Bureau of Navigation, that they might qualify even though they had not been at such school. That was the provision of the act of 1915, but we limited the number of members of a crew, certificated as A. B.'s under the last provision, on any vessel to 25 per cent of the whole number of A. B.'s required. This was done because we believed that no vessel ought to go to sea with more than 25 per cent of its required able seamen having only one year's actual experience at sea, and no previous special training for the service.

This act now before us is intended to help build up the American merchant marine. And how? When we passed the act of 1915, we had about 2,000,000 tons of shipping to which it applied. We had only that much shipping to be supplied with crews. Now we have about 8,000,000 tons, and we expect by the end of next year to have 14,000,000 tons, and consequently the demand for able seamen under the existing conditions has increased.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The demand has increased, and to meet that demand there have been schools organized. I want to say to you that, under the testimony before our committee, it takes one member of the deck crew for every 500 tons of shipping, and with 14,000,000 tons of shipping it will require 28,000 members of deck crews to man our expected tonnage. Sixty per cent of that would be some 16,800, which is the number of able seamen that would be required to man the 14,000,000 tons under existing law. The fact is that in this country to-day there are men holding A. B. certificates amounting to far more than 16,000, to far more than 28,000. As I remember the testimony, we have

to-day over 50,000 able seamen (certificated) in the United States, but it is difficult in this abnormal time for men owning vessels at a given place to secure the necessarily equipped A. B.'s, and certainly I am willing to go back and commence over and let the law that we pass to-day fix the standard that we fixed in 1915, and say that we will begin with requiring 40 per cent of the deck crews to be A. B.'s for the first year after its passage, and then increase the percentage as we did in that act.

Now, if it will need 28,000 for the deck crews, 40 per cent of whom need to be able seamen, that will be only about 11,000 able seamen. There are over 50,000 of them in the United States, and if we pass this law our administrative officers ought to strictly enforce it. It is difficult to give a strong or compelling reason for lessening the requirements of the present law in any manner.

This bill only reduces the service qualification as to American boys. Now, for the sake of encouraging the American boys to go to sea, I am not fighting—at least, with any great degree of emphasis—the reduction of the qualification as it is made in this bill, as applied only to American citizens. The qualifications in the old law of 1915 as to foreigners still stands; but if our American boys want to go to sea and spend nine months, after graduating from one of these schools, on board a vessel, and then stand the examination, I am willing to make the experiment, although the testimony before us was that no man should really be an able seaman until he had had more than nine months' experience. Oh, I know he can scrub decks and do a great many other things on a vessel in normal times, but when the emergency comes, and he has to climb and twist around and know what to do, it is a different proposition. And a witness before us said that no period of years made the able seaman; it was the condition of the sea which he navigated; that when you came to an emergency the seamen longest on the sea was best qualified; and every seaman that came before us told us that a seaman, in order to be an able seaman, ought to have three years' service on deck. We have cut it down because there is no longer the same rigging to climb that there used to be, when every man had to be an able seaman. We do not have to have every man always an able seaman, but we do have to have them in emergency. And I am willing to make the experiment and say that we will try the American lad and give him, at 19 years of age, nine months of experience. Let him stand an examination after going through school, and if the Bureau of Navigation says he is competent and qualified physically and mentally, give him a trial.

I do not agree with the statement that these raw recruits that went to our merchant marine did fill the bill. They could not do it. We want to beware lest we go too far; and if this bill is tried and found wanting in that respect, we can put back the full requirements of the law of 1915. So I am not going to make any great kick on this bill. It does not change existing law greatly.

I have this further to say: A provision is put in here for nine months' experience on deck at sea as a qualification for an A. B. in order to encourage the young American. I somewhat doubt whether that is encouragement for a young American to go to sea. If it is, it is a discouragement for one, having been there a long time, to stay at sea.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I would like just two minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. The certificate of an A. B. is an asset. If you make it too cheap, it will not be prized. You start an American on a sea life, you give him three years' experience, and when he finds some whipper-snapper, that has not been at sea more than nine months, standing as high as he does, will it not discourage him? I believe there is grave question in this bill, but in order to forward the American merchant marine I yield my judgment to that of the rest of the committee and say we will go along; we will try it. I am for the upbuilding of an American merchant marine, so that henceforth the American flag will wave on every sea, and I am willing to try anything to make our merchant marine a great success. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, it is rather hard for a layman to follow after the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY]. So I am going to say in a very few words what I think about this bill, and then I would like to turn your attention to the question of ships.

There is no doubt that it is necessary for us to pass some legislation of this kind at this time. A great many young men

have had experience at sea. They do not care to stay at sea if they can not retain the present positions they occupy. We are bringing forward this afternoon a Senate bill which requires the Shipping Board to carry out the navigation laws as required on private vessels. If that is done, undoubtedly some of these young men will not be able to hold their present positions. So I believe, and I think most Members will agree with me; that this is a piece of proper legislation. It is useless for us to try to prepare young men to go to sea unless we prepare ships for them to go in. At the present time very few ships are being sold by the Shipping Board or have been sold. If these ships do not get into private hands, naturally the Government will run them. With the tremendous amount of shipbuilding that is going on to-day the Government will gradually find itself out of the business.

The private ships will take business because of their better operation and better management. When this happens, of course, the Government ships will probably stay in our harbors without any use being had of them.

There have been a number of questions asked by Members as to the authority which the Shipping Board had for selling ships. I wish to call attention to the emergency shipping act of June 15, 1917. In section 4 of that act it is provided that—

All ships constructed, purchased, or requisitioned under authority herein or heretofore or hereafter acquired by the United States shall be managed, operated, and disposed of as the President may direct.

At the present time the Shipping Board is acting under that provision, and it can, if it so desires, sell ships in any part of the world. The original shipping act also has a sale clause, as follows:

SEC. 7. That the board, upon the terms and conditions prescribed by it and approved by the President, may charter, lease, or sell to any person, a citizen of the United States, any vessel so purchased, constructed, or transferred.

Section 8 also says:

That when any vessel purchased or constructed by or transferred to the board as herein provided, and owned by the United States, becomes, in the opinion of the board, unfit for the purposes of this act, it shall be appraised and sold at public or private competitive sale, after due advertisement, free from the conditions and restrictions of this act.

That means that when they find a ship that is not useful to them they can sell it to foreign account; otherwise they must sell it to American account.

Mr. Hurley, recognizing the general sentiment of the country and, I think, the sentiment in this body that ships should be sold to American account, started—and I have no doubt that thought originated in his mind when the Committee on Appropriations recommended that he should sell ships to raise money to finish the balance of the ships—Mr. Hurley started to sell the ships. The board was then fairly well established, having offices in a number of different ports. When he left the board on July 31 he wrote me a letter, and said:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD,
Washington, July 31, 1918.

HON. GEORGE W. EDMONDS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I feel I would be remiss if I failed to call to the attention of your committee the subject of an additional depreciation to be allowed on ships.

The history of ships' values shows radical and sudden fluctuations. At the present moment, and probably in the immediate future, ships can earn a profit on the basis of the Government cost. In view of past experience, however, the prospective purchaser of ships at Government cost hesitates primarily, because under the presently allowed depreciation for taxation purposes he can not reconcile a present investment at Government cost with a not distant competitive market value of ships.

The rate of depreciation now allowed has grown out of prewar practice, and in the opinion of prospective purchasers of ships, is very much less than should be allowed. These purchasers feel that at present cost the investment must be written down in the next three years to a value which will be comparable with the probable cost of ships deliverable during the last of the three years. For instance, a ship sold to-day at \$210 a dead-weight ton should stand on the purchaser's books at the end of three years at not more than \$127.50 a dead-weight ton, which, considering its age, would place it on competitive parity with a new ship coming out at \$150 a dead-weight ton. All present indications point toward such a value. In fact, contracts can now be made for delayed deliveries at approximately this price for the same type of ship that to-day represents a Government cost of \$210 a dead-weight ton.

It is rather difficult to establish just how much greater a depreciation should be allowed. I submit for your consideration a suggestion of a special annual depreciation of 10 per cent for a period of three years, over the normal 5 per cent. Such special depreciation, carrying a tax exemption for three years, might well be allowed on condition that at the expiration of the three years, or prior thereto, the fund thus created is applied to the construction of a new ship in an American shipyard. It might well be provided, moreover, that this fund should be set aside as a special depreciation fund, and deposited in a bank as such. If at the expiration of the three-year period the purchaser has not applied such untaxed special depreciation fund to the construction of a ship in an American shipyard, either as a whole or part owner, he should, of course, be required to pay to the Government the full tax which he would have been called upon to pay had this special depreciation not been allowed. It is possible that it might be wise to continue the special depreciation allowance beyond the three-year period, but in that event it might also be wise to have it less than 10 per cent for the additional years.

There is no difference of opinion as to the desirability of building up the American merchant marine, and also encouraging construction of ships in American shipyards. I feel very strongly that this suggestion of a nontaxable depreciation allowance on ships purchased from the Government is fair to both the purchaser and the Government. It would help the Government to dispose of its ships at a fair value, say, approximately at cost; would put the purchaser of a Government ship in a position where he would feel reasonably sure that such investment would not be excessively great when compared with ships constructed and delivered two or three years from this date; and at the same time, unless the money is applied to the construction of new ships, the Government will not be the loser, as the purchaser is then compelled to pay to the Government all taxes which would have been payable under normal practice, just as though the special depreciation fund had not been allowed. Such a program, it seems to me, would add a great incentive both to the construction of new ships and the participation of American shipping men in the development of the merchant marine.

Sincerely, yours,

EDWARD N. HURLEY, Chairman.

That letter was written by Mr. Hurley on July 31. Immediately following his resignation, or a short time after his resignation, Mr. John Barton Payne was appointed head of the Shipping Board. In the Philadelphia Press of September 23 Mr. Payne made the first public announcement that I know of. He said, first, that he favored private ownership; and, second, this statement is made:

FAVORS PRIVATE OWNERSHIP.

Persons close to Mr. Payne say he does not contemplate any radical change in the policies of the board, although his method of carrying those policies out will differ from Mr. Hurley's. He is reputed to believe that the Government should not engage in any form of private business, and, therefore, he will attempt to bring to an end both the business of shipbuilding and of ship operation on the part of the Government. So long as these two activities must be engaged in by the Government, Mr. Payne wishes to exercise those functions with the smallest expenditure possible.

While it may be possible to bring the business of shipbuilding to an end rapidly, and thereby enable the disbanding of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, the business of ship operation must continue until all the Government ships are sold to private interests or permanently disposed of.

Under the Payne plan of rigid economy this last promises to be a long drawn out affair. Mr. Payne is reputed to be opposed to writing off \$1,000,000,000 of the cost of building our vast merchant marine. He would prefer to return to the Treasury of the United States every cent that Congress has appropriated for shipbuilding.

I presume we all agree with him if that is possible. I read further:

MUST SACRIFICE WOOD SHIPS.

Even under this scheme, Mr. Payne is ready to acknowledge that it will be impossible to obtain for the wooden ships the full cost to the Government. They must be sacrificed at a loss. But he hopes to avoid such a loss on the steel ships. Mr. Payne is said to be holding out for a quotation on the standard steel ships of \$210 a ton for spot deliveries. That is a higher price than has heretofore been asked for the vessels.

Many commitments of sales were made before Mr. Payne took charge and most of these were made through the New York sales office established under the Hurley administration. Mr. Payne is said to be planning to discontinue the New York sales office entirely.

Under the suggested Payne plan, it is said, with the full cost quoted on ships offered for sale, the purchaser would be required to make a cash payment of 25 per cent, and payments of 20 per cent each year until the whole had been paid. Interest would be charged on the deferred payments. Such a marking up of the value of these ships would check the ship sales, and the Government would be compelled to continue its possession and operation. So long as the Government is compelled to continue operating such ships as it owns, Chairman Payne believes that the Government should enjoy the full return from such operation.

Again we agree with him.

Now, that was Mr. Payne's statement, made on September 23. Now the situation, gentlemen, as I see it, is this: The Shipping Board can not sell ships at the present price.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. EDMONDS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I just want to enforce the gentleman's suggestion. This bill has nothing to do with the policy of the sale of our ships?

Mr. EDMONDS. No. I realize that.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I think it is altogether appropriate for the gentleman to make that statement.

Mr. EDMONDS. I made that statement, that we could not man the ships unless we had the ships operating.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. This is somewhat outside of the bill. Does the gentleman think that for the interest of this country, that as to the ships that we have to sell, many of which are said to be defective, if we put them on the market would it not be wise to let them bring the highest price they would bring on the open markets of the world?

Mr. EDMONDS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. No matter whether the purchaser was an American or a foreigner?

Mr. EDMONDS. I just want to go a little bit further in this sale of ships, because I think the House should know the condition of affairs, and I think it is of the utmost importance at the present time that some understanding should be had as to what

should be done with these ships if we expect to operate them. Certainly they will not be operated by the Government at the present cost of operation when freights return to normal.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to his colleague?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. HULINGS. I would like, if the gentleman cares to express an opinion to the House, to know whether he thinks it possible under the present navigation and seamen acts of this country and the cost of building ships in this country, to run an American merchant marine in competition with the world—the Japs, for instance, or the English?

Mr. EDMONDS. It is possible, providing that we are prepared to give certain aid.

Mr. HULINGS. Now you are talking.

Mr. EDMONDS. No; I am not speaking of a subsidy. What that aid will be will be a question to be decided when shipping is back to its normal operation cost and you know what is necessary.

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; but I have an idea that if a man got a ship for nothing, if it were made a gift to him, he could not run it in competition with the world.

Mr. EDMONDS. That is not so.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman will remember that a good while back Mr. Hurley issued a statement in which he contended that Americans, from the lessons they had learned from the steel people, could construct ships and, on account of improved terminal facilities and their ability to make more trips, could compete with foreign countries.

Mr. EDMONDS. I remember that statement of Mr. Hurley's. I remember a good many statements of Mr. Hurley's. I hope some of them will come true. On October 30 Mr. Dean, the general counsel of the Shipping Board, wrote me a letter giving me a detailed list of ship sales of the wood and steel cargo ships, stating that the Shipping Board had sold 16 wooden ships of 68,729 tons and 5 smaller ships of 17,500 tons. They had in contemplation the sale of 20 ships of 80,000 tons, which sale I do not believe has yet been completed. Of course, all the wooden ships were sold at a loss; some of them at a great loss. There were also two ships of 7,000 tons being sold to the Continental Transportation & Oil Co., which sale was completed. Those were composite ships.

Of the newly constructed steel cargo ships we had sold three—the *Wisconsin Bridge*, the *West Catanace*, and the *Redondo*. This was on August 30 of this year. The price of the *Wisconsin Bridge* was \$210 a ton; of the *West Catanace*, \$225 a ton; and of the *Redondo*, \$210 a ton.

There was in contemplation the sale of 12 medium-sized ships, which sale had not yet been completed, and there were 2 other ships on which a man had made a proposition to trade some ships for them. The lowest price on those ships was \$200 a ton, and on August 30 but 3 steel ships had really been sold and delivered. They sold a steel schooner which I do not believe has been delivered yet. They sold 2 steel tugs which have been delivered, one of which cost \$76,899.47 and was sold for \$48,000. The other one cost \$61,750.69 and was sold for \$55,000.

There were also sold seven ships that we requisitioned on the Great Lakes, and there were three of which the sale at a later date was contemplated. One of these ships sold on the Great Lakes, the *Blue Hill*, was built in 1893 by the Cleveland Shipbuilding Co., and cost the Government \$1,250,810.27. She was sold to the Massey Steamship Co., of Cleveland, for \$150,000.

The *Frontenac*, built in 1889, cost the Shipping Board \$876,178.75. She was sold to the Davie Shipbuilding & Repairing Co. for \$85,000.

The *Manola*, which cost the Shipping Board \$1,186,941.39, was sold to the Davie Shipbuilding & Repairing Co. for \$77,500. These ships were all old ships.

Then they bought from the George Hall Coal & Coke Corporation, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., three fairly good ships, the *Adrian Iselin*, which cost \$541,066.74, the *Lucius W. Robinson*, which cost \$501,881.99, and the *A. D. Mactier*, which cost \$509,493.01. These are all Shipping Board figures. I am not using my own figures. These three vessels were sold back to the George Hall Coal & Transportation Co. for \$200,000 apiece. The Shipping Board took those boats, enlarged them about 10 per cent, had hardly any use for them—I doubt if they ever left the Great Lakes—and sold them back at a loss on the three ships of about \$900,000.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I suppose the gentleman would have the House and the country understand that these ships were bought, and some of them remodeled and taken from the Great Lakes to the high seas with a view to foreign service during the war, and when the war was over, of course, they were not of any value to that service.

Mr. EDMONDS. The *Adrian Iselin* was taken over by the United States Shipping Board on June 20, 1918, and returned to the George Hall Coal & Transportation Co. on June 2, 1919. During that time she was enlarged. The probabilities are that she never left the Lakes. The same is true of the other steamers bought at about the same date. That is a part of the history of these steamers on the Great Lakes. So you see that there have really been only three steel ships sold by the Shipping Board on August 30.

Now, I want to call your attention to the markets of the world. I am not going into the investigation end of it at all. I have the data on all these ships.

This morning I got a letter from Sudden & Christenson (Inc.), of New York, which I will read:

SUDDEN & CHRISTENSON (INC.),
New York, N. Y., October 7, 1919.

HON. GEORGE W. EDMONDS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Knowing that you are interested in the price of ship tonnage, we are inclosing one of Frank Waterhouse & Co.'s circulars, offering a British steamer which figures at the current rate of exchange about \$141 per ton.

We have heard on the street that new construction can be purchased from Germany at \$120 per dead-weight ton, and that this can be had by securing permission through an allied commission or through British owners, who are to be compensated for their losses by German new construction.

We are also inclosing Nauticus, of October 4, and call your attention to page 31, which we have marked, showing recent sales of new British tonnage which figures at current rate of exchange about \$125 per ton.

Very truly, yours,

K. D. DAWSON, Manager.

The circular letter of Frank Waterhouse & Co. which they sent me reads as follows:

FRANK WATERHOUSE & CO., AND
UNIVERSAL SHIPPING & TRADING CO.,
New York, N. Y., October 6, 1919.

GENTLEMEN:

New contract.

One 4,300-ton dead-weight steamer, with long bridge and very fine specifications, building at first-class British yard: delivery, August, 1920. Owners willing to dispose of same for £145,000 net.

If you are interested in the above steamer, please make best firm offer for cabling.

Yours, very truly,

H. H. HAMNER.

The Government of Australia has been buying ships, something like we have, for her merchants during the war. The first Australian number of the New York Evening Post makes this statement:

When it is remembered that there were years Australia had no ship-building ambitions at all, the true significance of these facts will be appreciated.

Let us see what they are doing in Australia. They are building there six 12,500-ton dead-weight steel ships, most of this steel brought from England. The price of those ships is \$27 per ton. Allowing exchange around \$4.25, that is about \$115.

They are building 14 6,000-ton dead-weight ships in Australia, and the price of those ships is \$26 per ton, or about \$110 per ton at present rates of exchange.

They are also building six 12,800-ton dead-weight refrigerator ships, at \$35 per ton, or about \$150 per ton.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Is not Australia one of the high-wages countries of the world?

Mr. EDMONDS. It is.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. About like Canada and the United States?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If they can build ships and get out at the higher prices, why can not we do it?

Mr. EDMONDS. I have no doubt you can contract for a ship here for \$150 or \$160 a ton.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. In other words, we can compete with the world in building ships.

Mr. EDMONDS. I have said so before. Now, here is an advertisement of the Moore Shipbuilding Co.:

The contracts upon which we have been working for the Emergency Fleet Corporation are being rapidly completed.

We are, therefore, able to contract for the construction and early delivery of our standard 9,400 and 7,100 tons deadweight cargo steamers and 10,000 tons deadweight tank steamers.

During September we will contract to deliver one steamer in April, 1920, one in May, and two each month thereafter.

These men are prepared to do business without any question.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. If they do undertake to enter into competition and do build ships and sell them as cheaply as other ships, will we not have a condition in which we can compete with the commerce of the world?

Mr. EDMONDS. I think that will go a long way toward it. Now, I am only talking to-day in order to get the Shipping Board into a frame of mind that it will let the ships go to our merchants, so that they can bring the price down to what they will have to be three years from to-day.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. And still the gentleman is not opposed to the Government receiving the market price for the ships.

Mr. EDMONDS. I want the Government to get every cent it possibly can, but I do not think the Government should retain the ships, holding them up for impossible prices, because no man can work that price out to-day.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I do not think so either, but if they have ships for sale in the markets of the world and they get an offer of \$150, they ought not to sell them for less than that.

Mr. EDMONDS. But let me read you how the merchants work it out:

Ship operators will be able to make a profit of \$60 a ton of shipping per year up until 1921. But a 10,000-ton ship costing \$210 a ton when purchased from the Government will represent a capital investment of \$2,100,000.

During the first year the owner will be able to earn \$600,000 net, of which amount the Government takes \$300,000 in excess profits' taxes, leaving to the owner or purchaser a profit of but \$240,000. To earn this much the owner has been compelled to pay down to the Shipping Board in cash 25 per cent of the sale value of the ship, or \$525,000, leaving a balance of \$1,575,000 plus interest unpaid.

During the second year under the proposed plan the owner would have to pay to the Shipping Board \$315,000, plus \$78,750 in interest on the purchase price of the ship, or a total of \$393,750. Deducting from this second payment the net earnings from the ship during the first year, the purchaser will be compelled to put up \$153,750 additional capital on his property.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. These figures are perfectly logical, but it seems to me that the purchaser will make his own figures on what he can earn and what the ship is worth to-day. The proposition, it seems to me, is for the Shipping Board to offer the ships for sale at the highest offer and receive the fullest market price, and let the purchaser work out his own salvation.

Mr. EDMONDS. I think that is absolutely true.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EDMONDS. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDS. I am trying to call attention to the fact that unless the Shipping Board changes its policy, they will have these ships on their hands for years.

Now, I have a suggestion to make of the way I think this should be worked out. I am preparing a bill along these lines:

First. Cancellation of all emergency legislation.

Second. Transfer of all emergency property to Shipping Board.

Third. Instructions to Shipping Board as to disposal of ships and authorization to accept part payments.

Fourth. Instructions to Shipping Board to discontinue building ships and to cancel all contracts for shipbuilding where it is for the best interest of the Government to do so.

Fifth. Instructions to Shipping Board to return requisitioned property of all kinds in which the Government has no financial interest as rapidly as consistent.

Sixth. Instructions to Shipping Board to as rapidly as consistent with good judgment withdraw Government funds from all investment and return the money to the Treasury of the United States.

Seventh. To discontinue making any new investment of Government funds.

My idea is that the board should as rapidly as possible place itself in position to operate only under the authority given to them by the original shipping act. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Judge ALEXANDER for allowing me to proceed now in order that I may attend a hearing. In the short time yielded me I want to speak in reference to a man who has just become connected with the Shipping Board. It is with a considerable amount of pride that I refer to this man who for years has been a personal friend of mine. I refer to Capt. I. N. Hibbard, now general supervisor of sea training and recruiting service of the Shipping Board.

Capt. Hibbard began his seafaring career as a boy before the mast and ended it as a captain of a full-rigged ship. At 21

years of age he became captain and for many years thereafter navigated his full-rigged ship from Liverpool to New York and from New York around the Horn to San Francisco. After he left the sea he became engaged in shipping to the Yukon and was then made superintendent of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co.

I feel that the Shipping Board is extremely fortunate in having obtained Capt. Hibbard in its service, and I predict that as long as he is with that board, owing to his experience, his fidelity, and integrity, the service will prosper and be a very efficient branch of the Shipping Board.

Let me submit a few figures on the shipping situation, which I feel may be of interest.

World's shipping.

[From Lloyd's Register. (Gross tons.) All classes of ships.]

	June 30, 1914.	June 30, 1919.
British.....	21,045,000	18,607,000
German.....	5,459,000	3,503,000
Norwegian.....	2,504,000	1,857,000
French.....	2,319,000	2,233,000
Japanese.....	1,708,000	2,325,000
Italian.....	1,668,000	1,307,000
Dutch.....	1,496,000	1,591,000
Swedish.....	1,118,000	992,000
Russian.....	1,053,000	541,000
Austro-Hungarian.....	1,055,000	714,000
American (sea).....	2,970,000	10,782,000
Total tonnage of above and of other countries.....		50,919,000

Losses from submarines.

	Dead-weight tons.
Neutral and allied shipping.....	21,400,000
Out of total previous to war of.....	59,465,000
Constructed during war (neutral and Allies).....	14,247,000
Enemy tonnage acquired.....	3,795,000
United States completed in 1918.....	3,103,000
Incomplete tonnage in 1918.....	2,540,000

Total United States constructed and under construction... 5,643,000

This was 50 per cent more than Great Britain built and 25 per cent more than was constructed by all the rest of the world.

In 1815 the United States had about half the tonnage of Great Britain.

In 1850 we had 3,500,000 tons, Great Britain had 4,232,000.

In 1861 we had 5,482,000 tons, Great Britain had 5,895,000.

In 1914 we had 2,970,000 tons, Great Britain had 43,054,000.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair please tell me how the time stands?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] 33 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the committee, it would be an act of supererogation at this stage to undertake an explanation of the immediate measure that is pending before the committee. The purposes of the bill have been rather fully explained by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROWE] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and others. As a matter of fact, I find myself somewhat in the attitude expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] on this particular bill. In view of the testimony disclosed before the committee in the hearings, I do not believe that the bill is of very great importance in the result that would be accomplished under its operation. The net effect of the bill, as far as it changes existing law, as now provided in section 13 of the seamen's act, is to reduce the period of training for American citizens from 12 months to 9 months, provided they have taken a course of training in one of these training schools and stand the other examinations provided by the authorities.

Now, that is the sum total of the effect of this bill, as I understand it. The object to be accomplished, as expressed by the sponsors for the measure, is to encourage the enlistment of Americans in the sea service of the Nation, from the standpoint of necessity, gentlemen of the committee. The facts disclosed at the hearings showed that we have already certificated in the United States 54,000 able seamen. The figures show that when our merchant marine reaches the peak of its tonnage it will only require about 14,000 able seamen to fill all the positions before the mast, even when we have an operating tonnage of 14,000,000 tons.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. CLEARY. Of course, you have to take into consideration the fact that these young men are able to do plenty of other

things as well as go on a ship, and when wages advance all around in other industries, as they are advancing, it will tempt these young men to leave these places, so that it would be better to have as many men available as possible, especially when, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROWE] explained, the shipping has expanded from 2,000,000 tons to 8,000,000 tons. You should do everything you can to make it easy to keep them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the only reason why I am acquiescing in the passage of this bill; for, taking as admitted what the gentleman from New York says, it will leave a margin of the difference between 14,000 and 54,000 certificated able-bodied seamen in the United States to go out to these various other positions which he says they might be tempted to follow.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. We have training schools turning out more seamen, and in the course of the next year there will be a larger number of able seamen than 54,000, and it will take more than the next year before we get the 14,000,000 tons of ships.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That may be. I make these observations for the purpose of showing that there is no real emergency for the passage of this bill. It is predicated, as has been suggested, simply upon the theory that it would offer inducements which do not now exist under the law for Americans to take up the business of able seamen as a vocation.

The thing I wanted to take some time upon was to make some comment upon the question that has arisen here as to the operation of the seamen's act as affecting the wages of American seamen, and whether or not the raising of the wages of American seamen has induced, or will induce, an approximate raise in the wages of the seamen of foreign governments. Every thoughtful man who has given any consideration to the question of our merchant marine has feared that the great difficulty with which we would be confronted would be the cost of production of our vessels and the cost of operating them, in the overhead charge, largely involving the question of seamen's wages.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman was present, I presume, during the hearings that were had on this bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I was.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I was going to ask the gentleman whether any interests were heard there except the Shipping Board?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. I am expecting to quote very largely from the testimony of Mr. Andrew Furuseth, the chairman of the seamen's union, who appeared before the committee and made a very elaborate statement and gave some very illuminating evidence to the committee. He took the position, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama—and that is what I am trying to express here—that there was really no necessity for the passage of this bill from the standpoint of not having a sufficient number of able-bodied seamen under existing law to fill the vacancies in our merchant marine.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. May I ask whether the bill had his approval or met with his objection?

Mr. BANKHEAD. He was opposed to the bill as originally written, and I presume and think that he will be opposed to this bill. But this bill is in the nature of a compromise. The original bill proposed a reduction of the minimum service to 6 months. This bill puts it at 9 months. The existing law requires 12 months' service at sea for these young men whom I am talking about, who go through these schools, before they may become certified as able seamen.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The original bill provided that 20 per cent of the crew might be able seamen the first year, and 40 per cent the second year, and 50 per cent the third year, and this bill provides 40 per cent the first year, 45 per cent the second year, 50 per cent the third year, 55 per cent the fourth year, and thereafter 65 per cent of the deck crew.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The proposed bill that we are now considering carries out the provisions of existing law in that regard.

Now, on this question of wages, which was raised here by some question, the testimony shows that American seamen under the provisions of the seamen's act are now receiving \$75 per month on American ships. When Mr. Furuseth was examined before the committee he stated:

Mr. FURUSETH. On the American ships we were paying \$75 until the 28th of July, and now it is \$85 for sailors and \$90 for firemen. And the foreign vessels leaving ports of the United States are paying exactly that figure.

Mr. HARDY. As I understand, foreign vessels entering and leaving United States ports have had to take up every progress the American sailor has had?

Mr. FURUSETH. Absolutely. And what is more, they have to take up our progress as to the standards. When I was in Norway they were discussing in Norway the taking up of our standard of efficiency. That had been recommended by the commission some years before. They were discussing taking up the standard of efficiency that had been made the law in America.

Now, that is very interesting testimony, gentlemen, in view of the fact that it shows the moral and economic effect, as far as wages are concerned, of the high standards of pay set for American seamen under the operation of the seamen's act. This testimony is uncontradicted, and it shows that the foreign vessels leaving the ports of the United States are paying exactly that figure.

Mr. Furuseth's testimony shows that British seamen, by virtue of the increase in wages made to the American seamen under the American seamen's act receive exactly the same wages that American seamen are receiving, and the testimony shows that the same condition exists with reference to the seamen of Norway and Sweden. So, gentlemen, we see the beneficial effect of our seamen's act passed in 1915.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like five minutes more.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A great many of its critics looked upon that act with great apprehension, but its beneficial effect is that it has not only raised the standard of safety at sea in the protection of life and property and improved the living conditions of seamen, but by the very nature of its competition and its moral effect it has raised and will undoubtedly continue to raise the wages of seamen under foreign flags to the same standard of American wages. Gentlemen, if that prediction is true, we have met and solved one of the essential features of our competition with foreign trade for our merchant marine. I trust that the optimistic statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] will prove true, and I believe that it can be made to come true that we can produce tonnage in this country as cheaply as it can be produced anywhere in the world. If we meet that condition, then we have met and mastered, so far as these two essential propositions are concerned, every element of competition that will be necessary in order for us to continue to operate successfully these 14,000,000 tons of shipping that will be under the American flag within the next 12 or 15 months.

I was not a Member of Congress at the time the seamen's act was passed, but I have undertaken to give it a considerable amount of study, and I regard it in its operation as one of the greatest pieces of constructive statesmanship that has been passed in the last quarter of a century upon this great problem. [Applause.] It is proving in its operation the wisdom of those gentlemen who fashioned it and secured its passage through Congress and its approval by the President.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BANKHEAD. For a brief question.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know that under that act the seamen at any port can leave their vessel, require their wages to be paid, go off on every kind of carousing and drinking, and come back to the ship when they please, and the ship has to stay until they do see fit to come back?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I did not know that.

Mr. BLANTON. And that the wives and little children of the men at home frequently go without those wages when the voyage is over, whose benefits they had expected to receive.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand that the gentleman would stand for the repeal of the act then?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; but I would like to amend it in certain particulars. I think in some respects it is a great law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the trouble is that the gentleman has a basic misunderstanding of the provisions of the seaman's act, and that the things he complains of are not possible.

Mr. BLANTON. I have had such complaints made.

Mr. CASEY. Is not the logical conclusion to be arrived at that the gentleman from Texas is complaining because American seamen have been made freemen under the seaman's act?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I would rather have the gentleman from Texas answer that question himself.

Here is another thing that has been done: When the seamen's act was passed there was not a single native American certified and actually serving as an able seaman before the mast on the Pacific coast. Under the operations of that law it was testified before our committee the other day that, whereas for-

merly there was not a single one, this year on the Pacific coast alone the United States had 1,251 of its citizens as able seamen. There has been approximately the same increase on the Lakes and a larger increase on the Atlantic coast.

So that, gentlemen, I say, when we come to contemplate the real development of our merchant marine, the wisdom and the expediency and the prudence and sound judgment of the seamen's act continues to manifest itself and to grow in power and usefulness as the years progress. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will be glad to.

Mr. TINCER. Purely for information, I want to ask the gentleman if he understands why it is that the freight rates on fresh meats, for instance, have been increased from 60 cents, the prewar basis, to \$4.50?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I can not give the gentleman that information. That is a matter my friends who are here in control of Congress ought to adopt a policy on. That suggests another thing. The question was raised as to whether or not the Shipping Board was going to be allowed indefinitely the discretion of selling our ships. I say that is a question of policy that ought to be determined by the Congress of the United States and not by the Shipping Board. I am looking forward anxiously in the committee for the presentation of some concrete bill on the part of our friends in control of Congress fixing the policy for the disposition of our vessels, which is the greatest problem before that committee and before Congress in reference to the merchant marine. I was glad to hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS] say that he was framing and expecting to introduce shortly a bill suggesting a concrete policy.

The question of rates is a matter very important, and one that I think our committee and the Congress ought to give great consideration to, because I can readily see how it affects the country of the gentleman from Kansas and every other section.

Mr. TINCER. I did not ask the question as the member of any party, but to get the information.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I state candidly to the gentleman that I do not know the reason for that change. If the gentleman would take it up with the Shipping Board I think he could get some sort of an explanation, but whether it would be satisfactory or not I do not know.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to inquire whether these rates are on a parity with rates charged in other countries—whether they are competitive rates.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Not competitive; shipping rates can not be made stable, because they depend on the emergency, on the voyage, and other things of that character. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, while the seamen's act has many wise and salutary provisions, yet I can not agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that it is altogether perfect and wholesome.

Under such act section 4530 requires one-half of wages earned upon demand to be paid to every seaman at each and every port where any cargo is loaded or delivered. At these various ports temptations innumerable beset such seamen, and this provision and others of the act makes it possible, and even acts as an incentive, for the men to draw their money, go ashore, drink, gamble, and carouse until wages upon which wives and little children at home were confidently depending had been wastefully exhausted.

You will note from the following provision of section 4596, to wit—

Second. For neglecting or refusing without reasonable cause to join his vessel or to proceed to sea in his vessel, or for absence without leave at any time within 24 hours of the vessel's sailing from any port, either at the commencement or during the progress of the voyage, or for absence at any time without leave and without sufficient reason from his vessel and from his duty, not amounting to desertion, by forfeiture from his wages of not more than two days' pay or sufficient to defray any expenses which shall have been properly incurred in hiring a substitute.

that for a failure to proceed with his vessel to sea on time only a slight punishment of forfeiting two days' pay is imposed. Under subdivision 13 of section 4611 vessels can not depart from a port unless a specified per cent of the deck crew are rated as able seamen and unless 75 per cent of such crew are able to understand the orders of the officers. By reason of the above provisions, should a majority of the crew, after collecting their wages upon arriving at an intermediate port, yield to

the temptation of going on a spree, and after the initial intoxication should decide to prolong the spree, it would be an impossibility for the master to procure qualified men to take their places and he would be compelled to delay embarkation on schedule time and to await the pleasure of the crew as to when they would leave the port, and, while the ship might suffer tremendous damages, the men would suffer a nominal punishment of merely forfeiting two days' wages. I know of just such a case, where the crew went on a spree at an intermediate port of small significance and delayed the ship's leaving for weeks, causing the owners a loss of thousands of dollars resulting from a failure to deliver certain cargoes on time.

But I desire to use my time in discussing another subject.

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that every thinking man in this Congress has realized, especially within the last few weeks, that the transportation of our country, both by land and by sea, has ceased to be merely a private commercial enterprise in which only the corporation owners and the employed workmen are interested. But by reason of the general public's vital interest in the same there should be taken by Congress definite and proper steps to safeguard and protect the interests of the public.

I realize, especially in regard to railroad transportation, that the time has come when at this session of Congress definite action should be taken to make railroad strikes impossible in the future, such as is provided for by the Cummins bill. We must do this regardless of Mr. Gompers's threats. If it is necessary to take definite action in regard to railroad transportation to prevent strikes, why should it not likewise be necessary to take definite and decided action with regard to the transportation by sea? The general public is vitally interested in both.

Is there a man in this Congress who is not yet awake to the fact that cities like New York and Boston, Philadelphia and Baltimore, Chicago and San Francisco are absolutely dependent upon transportation by land and sea for the most of their daily existence? These cities do not carry more food supply than to last a few days, and we know by starving out through concerted strikes such big cities as I have mentioned there is within the hands of the labor organizations now in existence controlling the transportation on railroads and by sea a power now strong enough, if not controlled by proper laws, to force the Government into any kind of servile submission with regard to any kind of unreasonable demands they may make. Next to the organization of the four great railroad brotherhoods the seamen's organization to-day stands in strength, because on their action depends the transportation by sea of the food supply of the world.

I take it that the time has come when every thinking man in this Congress realizes that there must be taken vital, definite action in regard to every public service in which the people generally are interested, such that no union other than the union of the United States Government itself can hereafter tie up and control such transportation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for the additional time. When through interrogation this morning I called attention to the soviet pronunciamento signed at Seattle, Wash., October 2, 1919, by James A. Duncan, secretary of the Central Labor Union of Seattle, a copy of which each Member of Congress received in this morning's mail, some colleague intimated that it had no reference to the Government of the United States. Let me again call your attention to the fact that this soviet propaganda is addressed to "Honorable Members of Congress of the United States, Senators and Representatives, Washington, D. C.," and arrogantly advised us that the longshoremen of Seattle, with the approval of the Central Labor Council, positively refused to handle the 45 carloads of war material, embracing 7,000 cases of rifles, destined for Russia. And it is arrogantly stated by these American Bolsheviks that the advocates of the covenant of the league of nations pursue a policy toward Russia such as would tend to prove a most shameful insincerity upon their part, and that no red or other terror could be worse than operations conducted through American and allied support.

While I understand that this Duncan is not the one formerly at the head of the American Federation of Labor, nevertheless he uses the following letterhead, showing affiliation with the American Federation of Labor, to wit:

Central Labor Council of Seattle and vicinity, affiliated with American Federation of Labor, organized May 1, 1905.

Personally, I do not know whether it has been necessary for the United States Government to maintain troops and arma-

ments in Russia or not, because I do not know anything about the situation there. But I do know that the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, has authority to protect American interests anywhere in the world without a declaration of war, and, since our Government has seen fit to keep an armed force in Russia, I am not going to question same until I know that such act was unwarranted.

And I want to say right here that whenever the Government of the United States, whether Democrat or Republican in power, orders munitions, or under lawful regulations authorizes munitions to be sent to Russia, no men or combination of men outside of Congress, the lawful representatives of the people, have any right to interpose their private judgment and refuse to obey the orders of this Government.

This country is still under war regulations, for peace has not yet been proclaimed. These munitions could not be sent to Russia by any concern without the express order and permit of this Government. These men, therefore, know that this shipment of munitions, if made, is made under Government permit and order, else would not be made, and therefore when they purposely hinder and place obstacles in the way of such shipment they are obstructing the mandates of this Government itself.

But what respect have these men for the Government of the United States, or any Government, when they offer soviet rule in Russia as superior to conditions offered by our Government? This whole document reeks with soviet preachments and attempt to promote and incite mutiny against lawful order. In five-eighths of an inch heavy black-faced type this inclosed circular is headed: "Murder!"

That is a characteristic soviet heading for all red propaganda. But let me call your attention to the following excerpts from this circular:

Do you know that in Soviet Russia during the last 18 months 10,000 schools have been established?

Do you know that 15 regiments of French troops, operating near Odessa some weeks ago, mutinied and compelled their officers to return them to France?

Do you know that the crews of three French battleships mutinied while operating in the Black Sea about four months ago, on the grounds that they would have no hand in reestablishing an imperialistic Czarist despotism?

Do you know that our own troops, protecting the Murmansk Railway, became disgusted with the whole affair and almost mutinied because of the fact that they had been conscripted for the purpose of defeating the Kaiser and not for the purpose of reestablishing another military despotism equally as bad under a Russian Czar, and our Government was compelled to bring them home?

Do you know that for us to countenance the destruction of the Soviet Republic would be a direct violation of that clause in the peace treaty and the league of nations referring to the rights of labor?

Do you know that men of humane inclinations have bombarded Wilson with questions asking the reasons for his carrying on an undeclared war with troops conscripted to fight Kaiserism against the helpless Russians, etc.?

Do you know that we should bombard Congress with protests, sign thousands of petitions, hold mass meetings in every church, in every city, town, and village in this Nation, in every public hall, and let the lawmakers of this country and all others in position of authority know our exact position on the question of murder?

Do you know that 5,000,000 British trade-unionists are taking a referendum vote on the question of a national strike to force the British Government to cease blockading Russia, the only result of which is to starve thousands of innocent people to death?

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must stop this Bolshevik doctrine and propaganda. Soviet Russia must not be preached with impunity in this beloved Republic of ours. Congress must take definite, drastic action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD by placing therein these documents to which I refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEARY].

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Speaker, it is only because I am a member of the delegation from New York City that I wish to add a word on this subject, because in our great port we are continually observing the necessity for plenty of men to engage in all of the commercial activities that have made our city so great. We all know there that the reason for New York's great business industries and her great population is her seagoing commerce. It is because she is situated at the gateway of the country, the gateway of the West, of the South, of the East, and of the North. It is necessary to have sufficient men to man the vessels that come in there and bring their great wealth and business to this country. The land values of New York City are immense, so much so that the city and State together pay

something like one-tenth of the taxes of the whole country. All this is because of our foreign and domestic commerce. As I understand the provisions of the bill, it seeks to secure, to make more easy, the education of men to go into the seagoing business. In the past we have not had a sufficient number of Americans to man our vessels. We have had chiefly foreigners. I have had lots of experience in my own business, and while it is not a seagoing business, it is a river and sound business, and I know that the majority of our captains are Norwegian and Swede and other foreigners, because the young American boys, as we all know, particularly nowadays when we have so much first-class commercial education, prefer to engage in other pursuits. They prefer to be clerks or bookkeepers, or to be connected with business houses, so that it is difficult to get the American young men to engage in the seagoing business. As I understand the purpose of the bill and the purpose of the committee it is to make it easier to get American sailors. Of course we all know that years ago when the ships were nearly all sailing vessels it required skillful men to handle them, and it took years of practice, and at that time we were very jealous of the employment of our own people, and we made it more difficult for others, and it made it harder for people to come in and overcrowd, but nowadays the great question comes up of getting a sufficient number of men. We would like to get Americans as much as we can. These gentlemen have been spending their time trying to devise ways and means to accomplish that, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] has said that even though it is not in accord with his own views, he is willing to risk something, because he knows the necessity of accomplishing that purpose.

I am very interested in the passage of this bill and any other bill that will make it easier to man the vessels of America in that way and keep up this great commerce of ours.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. EVANS].

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, an effort is being made to obtain a law restraining any railroad from charging more for a shorter haul than for the longer haul, the shorter haul being included in the longer, over the same line and in the same direction. This statement is too simple to be understood, but it means that Congress is asked to enact a law that will prevent a railroad from charging, say, 55 cents per hundred for hauling cement from Kansas to Boise, Idaho, when the rate over the same line to the coast, 500 miles farther, is but 40 cents per hundred. Sixteen thousand tons of cement used in the Arrow Rock Dam, in Idaho, was hauled from Kansas, and it cost this Government \$48,000 more to haul the cement to Idaho than it would have cost to haul it 500 miles farther to the coast. A law is needed because the railroads wish to have the right, under the rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to do just such things.

The railroads say that they must meet "water competition" with an equivalent rate to coast cities in order to get freight that would otherwise be carried by water. The whole trouble is that it discriminates to destroy water traffic. These examples of discrimination against sections and States can be shown to have occurred numberless times. Impossible to state what this has cost Nevada, but more than a million dollars per year for 50 years, and it still continues, costing our producers more to ship wool to the greatest wool market, Boston, than from points 500 miles farther west.

A tariff on magnesite, tungsten, and other minerals would not be needed in our State only for this enormous drain of money which if it could have been saved and expended upon our struggling industries, would have doubled and again doubled our decreasing population.

The iniquity and injustice of this practice against a whole State must stop. Nevada demands an even break. All the protection this whole country needs is for our Government to protect its citizens, their lives and property, everywhere on earth. We hear much of freedom of the sea, while England dominated the great oceans any man could sail his tub to any port. England, upon small islands without great natural resources, but an indomitable spirit, excelled with free trade. The question of ships, railroads, and transportation is particularly a national problem, and one not to be compromised on any such narrow basis as benefits to single individuals, single industries, single States, or even single sections of the United States, but a problem to be settled with justice on the basis of national welfare. It is not a problem of rates between cities, but is much more. It is not a problem of railroad transportation alone, but of transportation in general, whether over highway, railroad, or steamship line; and the House committee is ap-

proaching the subject with hearings designed to bring out all the facts and to show just what step should be taken to insure justice both to the transportation industry and to the Nation which it serves.

This solution would seem to grant to each transportation industry—railroad and steamship line—a fair field in which to develop; a field in which the railroad and steamship line could compete in healthy rivalry ultimately specializing on that profitable work for which each had proven itself the better fitted.

We may encourage shipping and all other national interests by less of governmental paternalism and exactions. Give States equal opportunities. The time has come to stop the ever-increasing growth of bureaus and centralization of too much power at Washington over States which could more efficiently and economically act for themselves. The Union will be more strongly cemented by granting each State the care of its local and peculiar needs. Do not discourage your citizen with too much governmental instruction and interference, but encourage him to work out his own salvation.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, there are a few minutes remaining on this side, and I simply want to make a few remarks in reference to wages or what the elements are that will enter into the development of a merchant marine. Manifestly we can not maintain an American merchant marine successfully in foreign trade unless we can compete with foreign nations. We must build ships at the same relative cost as foreign nations, whether they be operated under Government or private ownership. Those ships must be equipped economically and operated efficiently. Efficiency in the operation of a ship is a prime factor, as it is in the operation of a factory or any other industry. There is a popular notion that almost anybody can operate a ship. That is a very great mistake. With our American skill, our American initiative, we may overcome some of the obstacles which confront us. For instance, the cost of construction and operation, if the difference is not too great, if we can throw into this equation the element of greater efficiency. Hence the effort to encourage American boys to go to sea, not that they may become ordinary seamen or able seamen, but that they may have the incentive to become officers and masters of the ships, is of prime importance as a factor and in order that we may develop our merchant marine. I have never been in entire accord with the view that the seamen's act would solve the question of wages in all the trade areas of the world. I can very well understand how under the act as it exists we may maintain relatively the same wage scale in trade between European ports and our own country, but we should not overlook the fact that if we would compete with foreign nations for the Far Eastern trade and for the South American and South African trade we must do so by a wage scale relatively the same and with the cost of construction and operation of ships relatively the same.

But the one purpose that should animate this Congress and the people of the United States and all interests affected is this, that whatever the cost we should have a great American merchant marine as a vehicle to carry and extend our foreign commerce and as a necessary auxiliary to our Navy for the national defense. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back whatever time may be remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon the action of the committee and the unity that has been maintained in the committee not only this year but for several years while the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] was chairman of the committee. When the original seamen's act was reported the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] took a great deal of interest in its preparation, and I was the minority member upon the conference committee, together with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY], and we came to an agreement very readily in the passage of the seamen's act. Each of us took an interested part in it and there was no opposition on the floor of the House from either the Republican or Democratic side of the House, and our action was commented upon by the Hon. JAMES R. MANN, the leader on the Republican side of the House, he giving great credit to the fact we had agreed so well in the committee in whatever was brought out in the way of legislation, especially in reference to this seamen's act, which had been threatened for a long time but could not seem to get to a place where it could be reported out and favorably acted upon on the floor of the House. Our committee came out unitedly on that proposition. The legislation that we have reported out from the committee to-day has been reported out with the unanimous action of the committee, without any dis-

sent, and I am sure it is something of which the House of Representatives may well be proud, that the committee does business for the sake of the people of the United States and not for the sake of advancing the interest of any one faction. I know so far as my service on the committee is concerned—and I have had a service now of more than 21 years on the committee—there has been no serious objection to legislation proposed except on rare occasions during the time that the gentlemen on the other side of the House had control of the legislation. I did make objection to some features of the first shipping act; I did not vote for the first shipping act as reported, but otherwise every thought that came to my mind was as to the question of how the country at large would be affected by the course that I determined to pursue; and when it was determined that our country should enter the late war I supported with true spirit of American manhood and true loyalty all the actions of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and we were not divided on party lines.

And I am gratified to relate that since I have been advanced to the chairmanship of the committee I find the same spirit prevailing in the disposition of the party on the other side of the aisle; that they do not raise partisan questions upon matters of legislation that have a broad purpose in view; and I think we are to be congratulated that we can thus far agree, and I hope that this spirit of unity will continue to exist and that we may work harmoniously together for the greatest good of all. I may add that this year I, as chairman of the committee, adopted a different practice from what we had before experienced, in that I appointed several subcommittees to take up the legislation before the committee. I have not myself been upon a single one of the subcommittees, but I appointed them, giving the Democrats liberal representation on the committees, but have not myself taken any part in indicating the action of those subcommittees. The reports of these subcommittees have been the free action of these subcommittees, and they have brought out their reports, and we have considered them fully in the committee when reported. I suppose some of you may think it rather peculiar I did not dictate them, because I am somewhat inclined to dictate sometimes when I feel compelled to do so. But I have gotten along harmoniously with the committee this year, and I want to compliment my associates on both sides of the aisle upon their loyalty of action this year, and I am pleased to refer to their loyalty of action last year. When we had the radio question under consideration last year in the committee, and in January, 1918, after we had faithfully discussed the radio question from beginning to the end and had drawn out all we could out of it—we have drawn a little more this year, but we drew all we could last year—and when we came to consider that bill in executive session, upon the motion of a Democrat every member of the committee approved the laying of the bill on the table, and the committee decided unanimously not to take up the question of Government ownership of radio.

I do not know how the committee feels this year, because we have not yet acted upon the proposition; but I hope we shall be able to agree upon the disposition of the bill if there comes a time when we shall come to a decision upon and report it for the consideration of the House. At any rate, I want the House of Representatives to understand how the committee have acted heretofore, and also that this committee is not like many committees of the House. We have no appropriation, and therefore we do not have any money to spend, and so far we have not spent any money. The witnesses who have come here have come at their own expense; and the only money that we have expended is what has been expended for the expenses of the hearings. No other money has been expended by the committee. We have tried to be economical, tried to get along without the expenditure of money; and I am well satisfied with the record thus far made by the committee, and I hope it will be maintained to its end. This amendment that has been brought in to-day and is being considered is one that had long consideration. It is one that I am sure will be, if adopted by the House—and I certainly hope that it may be—to the advantage of an American merchant marine. We have considered a great many questions and have not arrived at a conclusion on all of them. At the same time the committee are considering everything that they believe will be of advantage to the American merchant marine, and we hope in the meeting that comes a week from to-day we shall be able to bring out some other legislation for your consideration that will meet your views as fairly and as fully as we hope your views will be in accord with us in reporting out this bill and enacting the same into law. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a reading of the bill.

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Before proceeding to the question of the passage of the bill is it not necessary that it should be engrossed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; was read the third time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whether it would have any effect on the validity of the passage of the bill that the House has just passed or not, but I have no recollection whatever of the bill having been read by sections for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill is being considered in the House under the Calendar Wednesday rule. It is not required that it be read for amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That answers my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill was read in full, the Chair will state, before the consideration of it.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REGULATIONS FOR VESSELS OF SHIPPING BOARD.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call up for consideration the bill S. 633.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts calls up the bill S. 633, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 633) extending the provision for the regulation of steam vessels to vessels owned or operated by the United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all steam vessels owned or operated by the United States Shipping Board, or any corporation organized or controlled by it, shall be subject to all the provisions of title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the regulation of steam vessels and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "States" insert "passed at the first session of the Forty-third Congress."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to occupy an hour's time on the proposition.

The bill came from the United States Senate, and it referred to title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. Not being a lawyer, it puzzled me to know what title 52 was. I took the trouble to find out what it was, and proposed the amendment that is now in the bill. Would the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] like any time on the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest that I was not at the meeting of the committee when this bill was considered and reported out, and my attention was called to the amendment the first time last night when I looked over the bill and the report. I question the propriety of the suggested amendment. The bill provides:

That all steam vessels owned or operated by the United States Shipping Board, or any corporation organized or controlled by it, shall be subject to all the provisions of title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the regulation of steam vessels and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto.

Now, title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, second edition, 1878, relates to transportation of passengers and merchandise and the inspection of vessels. And I think that is a sufficient description. And if we undertake to limit it by the amendment suggested by the committee, we may make an error, because title 52 of the Revised Statutes of the United States includes all the acts relating to that subject from the beginning. It is a revision of all the acts relating to the subject from the early days. Hence I think it is quite well enough to leave it in its present form. If we amend it, it will have to go back to the Senate, and, in my opinion, it is unnecessary to do that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It is not objectionable to me if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER], being a lawyer of long standing, reaches that conclusion. But if my memory serves me, I sent the secretary of the committee to confer with the gentleman before I put the amendment in the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The clerk of the committee came to me and wanted to know what title 52 meant. I got him the Revised Statutes of the United States and called his attention to title 52, but I did not suggest any amendment. It never occurred to me that an amendment was necessary.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. He reported back to me that the gentleman approved the amendment, and the committee voted the amendment into the bill. I thought he had conferred with the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. He was in error about that.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. It can be cured by striking out the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. By just not agreeing to it, and then passing the bill in the present form.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. That will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I am not a lawyer, but I must say when I saw "title 52" I was a little bit puzzled. I do not think any lawyer would have been, but I was, and I took the trouble to look it up. I thought it needed explanation. I can see from what the gentleman from Missouri states that I was wrong. I stand corrected, and I move to strike it out.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that this bill should pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri seek recognition in his own right? The time is an hour.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There has been a question whether or not the vessels belonging to the Shipping Board would come under our steamboat-inspection law. The Shipping Board, however, has conceded, in the interest of good administration, that they would come under our inspection laws, and they have been inspected by the Steamboat-Inspection Service. You will understand that service is under the Department of Commerce, and this bill is simply to clear up that question and make it clear that all vessels owned and operated by the Shipping Board shall come under the provisions of our general laws as to the inspection of vessels. I think the bill ought to pass.

I have nothing further to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the mere stating of the third reading carry with it the engrossment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not necessary to engross a Senate bill. It is engrossed in the Senate.

Mr. BLANTON. The House does not afterwards engross it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

The question is on the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] has a couple of bills which were in the charge of his subcommittee, and I yield to him.

CHANGE OF NAMES OF VESSELS.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House bill 3620.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan calls up House bill 3620, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3620) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is upon the Union Calendar. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that that motion is not in order on Calendar Wednesday. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3620. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3620, with Mr. ROGERS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3620, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation shall, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, be empowered to change the names of vessels of the United States on application of the owner or owners of such vessels when in his judgment there shall be sufficient cause for so doing.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioner of Navigation, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, shall establish such rules and regulations and procure such evidence as to age, condition, where built, and pecuniary liability of the vessels as he may deem necessary to prevent injury to public or private interests; and when permission is granted by the Commissioner of Navigation, he shall cause the order for the change of name to be published at least in four issues in some daily or weekly paper at the place of documentation, and the cost of procuring evidence and advertising the change of name to be paid by the person or persons desiring such change of name.

SEC. 3. That for the privilege of securing such changes of name the following fees shall be paid by the owners of vessels to collectors of customs, to be deposited in the Treasury of such collectors as navigation fees: For vessels 99 gross tons and under, \$10; for vessels 100 gross tons and up to and including 499 gross tons, \$25; for vessels 500 gross tons and up to and including 999 gross tons, \$50; for vessels 1,000 gross tons and up to and including 4,999 gross tons, \$75; for vessels 5,000 gross tons and over, \$100.

SEC. 4. That sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 2, 1881, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to change the name of vessels under certain circumstances," and section 5 of the act of July 5, 1884, entitled "An act to constitute a Bureau of Navigation in the Treasury Department," are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect 30 days after its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, for a great many years Congress at each session has been obliged to occupy considerable time in the consideration of applications on the part of owners of ships to change the names of their vessels. Under the present law the only way that the name of a vessel can be changed is by introducing a special bill in Congress on the subject.

It is apparent to everyone that such procedure, although it has been in use for a great many years, is little short of silly. I do not know why Congress heretofore has not expedited such matters as are provided in this bill. Heretofore when a special bill of this character had been referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, it was sent down to the Department of Commerce and their advice was requested.

The committee has made a thorough canvass of the bills covering a number of years, and we have not been able to find a single instance where the recommendation of the department has not been accepted and acted upon.

This measure was presented at the last Congress, but in view of the more pressing work then pending it was impossible to call it up. We submitted the bill to the department, and I am sure you will be interested, if you have not already read the report, in hearing the letter from the department, which in a large measure confirms what I have already stated to the committee. I read:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, September 27, 1919.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCOTT: I have received your letter of the 23d instant inclosing copy of H. R. 3620, a bill to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels, with a request for expression of my views on the bill.

This bill was prepared in this department on February 18, 1919, at the request of the chairman of your committee at the time.

The department expects that as the Shipping Board sells their vessels to private parties there will be a considerable demand for changes of names. These vessels will not be paid for in full in cash and the Shipping Board will retain mortgages against them, which, under the present law, would prevent the changes in names and necessitate the introduction of special bills.

This will be obviated by H. R. 3620, which permits the change of name even in the case of mortgaged vessels by the Commissioner of Navigation of this department, provided the interests of all concerned are properly protected.

The courts have repeatedly held in rendering opinions on cases involving the changes of names of vessels that such changes should be discouraged as far as possible. Provision has been made in section 3 of the act, therefore, for the payment of fees sufficient to accomplish this purpose to a considerable extent. This also will result in some revenue to the Government.

The department is much in favor of this bill.

Respectfully,

E. F. SWEET,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Hon. FRANK D. SCOTT,

Chairman Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I have no desire to further occupy the time of this committee in discussing the bill, unless some one wishes to ask me a question in regard to some phase of the bill which I may have overlooked.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Gladly.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. I will interrupt the gentleman to say that what the gentleman has said not only meets my entire approval but, like himself, I have often wondered why such a general statute had not been passed long before this, because it has seemed to me silly, almost, to require a procedure before a committee of the House in session, an investigation, a report on a bill, and then to wait the delay and the difficulty of getting it up to effect a change which by the administrative department of the Government could be as efficiently made as by legislative enactment; so that I think this bill ought to have been passed many years ago.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I will be glad to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Under existing law—

The Commissioner of Navigation shall, under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce, be empowered to change the names of vessels of the United States under such restrictions as may have been or shall be prescribed by act of Congress.

Hence, when it was desired to change the names of vessels in the past it has been the custom and it has been necessary to introduce a special bill for that purpose. Where the vessel was not mortgaged this was the provision of the law:

The Secretary of Commerce be, and hereby is, authorized to permit the owner or owners of any vessel duly enrolled and found seaworthy and free from debt to change the name of the same, when, in his opinion, there shall be sufficient cause for so doing. The Secretary of Commerce shall establish such rules and regulations and procure such evidence as to the age, condition, where built, and pecuniary liability of the vessel as he may deem necessary to prevent injury to public or private interests; and when permission is granted by the Secretary, he shall cause the order for the change of name to be published at least in four issues in some daily or weekly paper at the place of register; and the cost of procuring evidence and advertising the change of name to be paid by the person or persons desiring such change of name.

In order to avoid the trouble and annoyance of introducing these special bills to accomplish this purpose, for many years I have called the matter to the attention of the Department of Commerce and insisted that some bill should be framed, so that the Department of Commerce might change the names of vessels without coming to Congress and securing the change of names by special legislation.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I notice there are different fees for the changing of the names of vessels, and that when the tonnage is greater the fee is larger. What is the object? It does not cost more to change the name of a 5,000-ton vessel than it does of a 100-ton vessel.

Mr. SCOTT. Not at all.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Then what is the object? Is it for the Government to make money?

Mr. SCOTT. No; the object is this: The Department of Commerce, like many other departments of the Government, is run for the benefit of the citizens of the United States. It is not a money-making proposition. The really perfect way of running a Government public utility is to exact from the public only a charge which will pay the running expenses of that particular public utility. That would be the perfect way to do it.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Does this create a new department?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Will it require extra clerks?

Mr. SCOTT. I assume that it will require one or two, or a very small additional force.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Probably it is to pay those expenses.

Mr. SCOTT. Exactly.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Most of the fees will be paid by large vessels.

Mr. SCOTT. The sum is not large in any event. The largest amount is \$100. A shipowner could better afford to pay \$100 for getting the name of a large ship changed than some poor fellow who possibly had a small fishing smack of 100 tons could afford to pay \$10.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. That is very true, but it seems to me the fee ought to be the same in either case. When a mortgage is recorded, it makes no difference whether it is for \$1,000,000 or for \$1,000, it takes the same number of words, and the recording fee is the same.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman mentions the subject of recording mortgages—

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I am alluding to the law in my own State.

Mr. SCOTT. If I recall correctly, there is a specific charge for recording mortgages in the State of Pennsylvania, but in a number of States they make a charge for the recording of the mortgage, based on the amount of money involved in the transaction. I may say to the gentlemen that this is a taxation feature, however, rather than a recording fee.

Mr. CLEARY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest something which may throw a little light on this?

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly.

Mr. CLEARY. In the harbor of New York, where there are thousands of vessels of all kinds passing to and fro, my concern owns about 100 vessels. We have some boats worth about \$5,000, and we have some worth \$25,000. Now, the \$5,000 boat will earn a very small amount in comparison to the \$25,000 boat, and we can as easily pay \$100 in one case as to pay \$10 in the other case. That is one of the reasons.

Now, as to the reasons for changing the names: We have often bought boats of other lines. Our line is Cleary Bros. There is another line called the McWilliams Line, and another the Blue Line. They have their boats named for themselves, *McWilliams No. 1*, *McWilliams No. 20*, and so on. If we should buy some of these boats we would not want to advertise the McWilliams Line, so we would change the name to something else. It would be necessary to change it. That is one of the reasons for changing names. And there is a good reason for the difference in the fee. One craft has so much greater earning power than another that it is just as hard to tax one \$10 as it is to tax another \$100.

Mr. SCOTT. I am indebted to the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Gladly.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I do not desire to throw any discord into the harmony of the Committee on the Merchant Marine or this committee. But I would like to ask if the subcommittee considered the question of advisability where a change of name is authorized of requiring that fact and the date of the change to be recorded on the ship's papers, so that any man dealing with a particular ship should have notice of what names that ship had been under heretofore, and so be in a better position to look up liens, mortgages, incumbrances, and so forth.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a pertinent question, and I am indebted to the gentleman from Maine for asking it. At the present time under rules and regulations of the Department of Commerce the fact of a change of name is carried, and I assume that, exercising the same judgment they have exercised heretofore, they will formulate rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the bill, which will result in the protection of the interests of the public at large.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I think that is material and should be covered by rules and regulations, and I am glad to know that the committee has it in mind.

Mr. SCOTT. I assume the Department of Commerce will so regulate the affairs by rules and regulations that that provision will be amply secured, and I wish to supplement that statement by saying that Congress in the bill provides that when permission is granted by the Commissioner of Navigation—

he shall cause the order of a change of names to be published in some daily paper at the place of documentation.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. That takes care of anybody at the place of documentation, but it might not meet the situation where a vessel was a thousand miles away and some one who wanted to make a loan on her, furnishing supplies, and so forth, but I think the gentleman has covered the question fully that was in my mind. If the Commissioner of Navigation requires this thing to be done, the situation is fully met.

Mr. SCOTT. I may say this to the gentleman, that in the publication of the vessel's register the names under which the ship has previously been known are put in brackets. I do not know how long they do that, but I assume a sufficient length of time to make secure that no possible advantage can be taken of the change of name. When it goes along a sufficient length of time, so that the ship becomes known by the name she is carrying, I assume they will eliminate the brackets indicating her previous names.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is important that these measures dealing with our merchant marine be passed. Of still greater importance, however, is proper provision for training the men who are to have the places of leadership in our Navy and merchant marine.

The greatest navy in the world, the biggest merchant marine that ever dotted the seas, would be useless unless there were trained men to man and command the ships.

One of the sinister signs in the situation as to naval affairs is the account in the newspapers of the day that two midshipmen in attendance at the United States Naval Academy, at Annapolis, have recently attempted to commit suicide because of unbearable conditions there.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Times of to-day. Here is the opening statement:

ANNAPOLIS, Md., October 8.

Well-authenticated reports state that another midshipman of the fourth class has taken poison. His name is reported to be Weatherstein, but his first name and home could not be ascertained.

This makes the second case of its sort in the last three days. P. H. Seltzer, of Lebanon, Pa., on Sunday drank a mixture of ink and iodine and stabbed himself twice over the heart.

Weatherstein, it is said, drank an ounce vial of iodine. He is said to have walked from his room in Bancroft Hall to the sick bay after taking the poison. Here he became violently ill, and was taken to the naval hospital, according to reports.

Mr. Chairman, an hour before I noticed that article I received a letter written by a midshipman at the Naval Academy. He gave a statement of the cruel and heartless hazing to which he had been subjected. His letter, disconnected and broken, gave evidence of the mental strain and torture under which he suffered.

Only a few months ago that boy was filled with intense pride and enthusiasm over successfully passing the entrance examination for Annapolis. He had planned for years to enter upon a naval career, and all his dreams seemed realized. He was supremely confident of his ability to meet any test which might come—physical, mental, or moral.

Now his one desire seems to be to get away forever from Annapolis and everything connected with it. There has been a revulsion of feeling, which, to my mind, could only come through the suffering of intolerable indignities.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is highly important that Congress know the truth as to conditions at this training school from which must come those who will direct the naval affairs of America.

If the experience of other Members of this body has been similar to mine, the situation is serious. I have a vacancy now at the Naval Academy because of the resignation of the lad I had named. He, too, started out with the enthusiastic determination to spend his life in the Nation's service on the high seas. In six months his enthusiasm had given way to dislike; his fervor to complete disgust.

I confess that I am not prepared to say whether the fault lies altogether with the boys or with the institution. In view of this published statement that two lads chose to die by their own hand rather than endure the ills they suffered in the academy, it seems to me that Congress should have the exact facts upon which to base a decision.

I have just introduced a resolution of inquiry, directing the Secretary of the Navy to give the House a report as to the truth of these publications; the practices indulged in in the "hazing" at the academy, and the number of midshipmen who have resigned during the past year, and the reasons for such resignations.

I have been informed that a son of the Secretary of the Navy himself is one of those who have resigned within the past year, and it may be possible that he suffered from the "hazing" which is reported to be carried to barbarous extremes at the Naval Academy. In any case, the Secretary of the Navy will be able to furnish us the information upon which we may base action.

Every Member of Congress is interested in the national institution, where those who shall carry out our naval and merchant marine policies are educated and trained, and I hope that if abuses are found to exist they will be remedied by the Secretary and Congress at the earliest moment possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will yield the gentleman some of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri that he has yet no time in his control.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire at this time whether any member of the committee is opposed to the bill?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is it not necessary that they should be? We are entitled to two hours' debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that on Calendar Wednesday the rule is that one hour shall be controlled by those favoring the measure and one hour by those opposing the measure, if there be any opposition.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I do not know of any opposition. The gentleman from Michigan has yielded 30 minutes to me. I just wanted to take a moment at this time to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] to the fact that the Washington Post this morning said that one of the midshipmen had become insane and three had attempted suicide.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is true. I was also calling attention to my own experience with midshipmen that I have appointed.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Are there not many cases where the boys are incompetent to keep up with their classes on account of very severe lessons, and is not that the reason for these resignations?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I take it for granted that the passing of the examination, a stringent physical and mental test, is proof as to the ability of the boys who enter West Point and Annapolis.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. That is often the case. I have known of many instances where boys have been admitted and within a year or two afterwards found the course too severe for them.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That may be true in some cases, but I am sure that in many cases it is not true. Inability to keep up with lessons is not the reason for all these resignations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, personally I can not see any reason why this bill should not pass. As I understand the matter, it is required, where a man wants to change the name of a ship upon which there is a mortgage, that there shall be an act of Congress passed to complete the transfer of the name. Bills that came before our committee went onto the Private Calendar, and in some cases for one or two years the Private Calendar was not taken up, and the bills lay there; and, of course, the man could not complete the transfer of the ship from one owner to another. If we are to have a large merchant marine, we must arrange in some way or other to have the ships handled as quickly as possible and with as little restriction as possible. Therefore, I think this is a piece of very wise legislation. The cost of the transfer, of course, should be borne by the owner, and I can not see why there should be any objection to different prices for different-sized ships.

To change the subject a little bit, I picked up this morning the New York Evening Post's first Australian number, and was very much surprised to see that our shipbuilding was a matter of comment in the legislature of Australia. They have been building ships over there for their merchants. They made contracts for wooden ships because they could not get steel ships, and, as with us, they canceled the contracts. However, they feel that they did very much better than we did in this country. The article states that contracts were canceled for certain wooden ships, the Government paying the contractors about \$25 a ton; and it goes on to state that in Australia it is reported that the American Government has canceled its contracts for 385 wooden vessels in about the same stage of construction at an average cost of about \$65 a ton for compensation.

The Australian Government therefore felt that it got out of its liabilities fairly well. Further along the article says:

The 14 wooden vessels ordered in America have been disappointing. They were all late in delivery, and those that have arrived have not served as a recommendation for American shipbuilding. The position in relation to these vessels is best set out in the following statement in Parliament by the minister in charge of shipping (Mr. A. Poynton). Mr. Poynton said that four vessels—the *Gethana*, *Culburra*, *Challamba*, and *Coolcha*—have been delivered by the Sloan Shipyard Corporation, at Seattle, U. S. A. Of 10 similar vessels for which a contract had been placed with the Patterson-McDonald Shipbuilding Co., three—the *Bellata*, *Bundarra*, and the *Bethanga*—had been delivered, and the *Birrika* and *Berringa* were expected to be delivered at the end of July and early in September, respectively.

"With regard to the remaining vessels," Mr. Poynton explained, "an alteration in the motive power was decided upon and arrangements made for the substitution of Diesel engines in place of the steam engines originally provided for. Particulars of these motor ships are: *Benova*, delivered July 15; *Baninda*, delivery expected about middle of August; *Balcatta*, launching expected beginning of August, ready for delivery end of September; *Boobyatta*, delivery indefinite; and *Borrika*, delivery indefinite. It will be observed that the date of delivery for the last two is indefinite in consequence of several strikes which have taken place at the shipbuilding yards, but the latest information I have is that deliveries should be one month between each, so that if the *Balcatta* is delivered at the end of September the *Boobyatta* will be handed over

at the end of October and the *Borrika* at the end of November. It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty that these expectations will be realized."

He was interrogated very much like we do here by Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING. Have wooden ships proved satisfactory?

Mr. POYNTON. I am sorry to say that wooden vessels built in America have not turned out satisfactorily. That is not our fault.

Mr. MAHONY. What about your supervisors?

Mr. POYNTON. One yard was taken over by the American Government and apparently they could not supervise it. We have had legal opinion with regard to getting redress on some things.

Mr. MAHONY. Have you not an officer there supervising in the interest of the Commonwealth?

Mr. POYNTON. Of course, we have. I do not know what he is doing. These ships were built months ago, and it is all very well to be wise after the event. At the time the contract was made the country rang with cheers for the prime minister for having the courage to do something for its interest at the time.

Apparently after this experience the Government has decided to stick to steel ships and either build them in Australia or order them in Great Britain.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. I do.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I want to ask the gentleman if, in connection with the article he is reading, there were any figures as to the cost of Australian wooden ships or whether the gentleman has any information on that subject?

Mr. EDMONDS. I think I can give the information in regard to wooden ships in just a second. It was \$130 a dead-weight ton for vessels 250 feet long, five-masted auxiliary schooners with Diesel-Bolinder engine developing about 240 horsepower.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. That is interesting taken in connection with the—

Mr. EDMONDS. Of course, these were built during the war, the gentleman understands.

Mr. WHITE of Maine. I say it is interesting, taken in connection with the cost of our wooden ships, which I understand were figured out at \$215 per dead-weight ton.

Mr. EDMONDS. I think that is about right.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDS. I will.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the gentleman discussing ships built by the Emergency Fleet Corporation for us on the Atlantic?

Mr. EDMONDS. Oh, no; these ships were built by permission, I assume, of the Emergency Fleet Corporation for the Australian Government, to be used by the merchants of Australia, because they were so short of shipping during the war. The contracts were placed here; and, as the gentleman notices, our shipbuilders unfortunately did not seem to take enough care in building the ships properly. If we expect to get the trade of the world, we must expect to cater to that trade, and if we do not we are certainly going to lose it. As the situation now stands, Australia has started to build ships herself. She has 6 steel vessels (5,500 tons), 14 steel vessels (6,000 tons), and she has 50,000 tons of 12,500-ton vessel building in Australia and 60,000 tons contracted for in Great Britain. The chances we have to get the Australian trade through the poor workmanship of the people in Seattle has been lost to us.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will yield to me, as far as the wooden ships which were constructed in Seattle are concerned, they were in large measure built in steel-ship yards; that is, in yards which were primarily for the construction of steel ships. Now, as far as wooden ships were concerned built on the Atlantic, I may best illustrate the character of the ship by calling attention to conditions at the Boston yard. They were contracted for by a couple of lawyers; and, I may say to the gentleman, further, that the people who are building wooden ships knew no more about building wooden ships than about the moon, and they were constructed out of unseasoned timber—in other words, green timber—and after they were completed and they were put in the water, why, they leaked like a sieve; so I think it is an unfortunate situation, and the House and the country should not infer that wooden ships can not be built, because until very recently that is the only character of ship that was on the ocean or Great Lakes.

Mr. EDMONDS. I would like to show the gentleman the advertisement of the Patterson-McDonald Shipbuilding Co. with a picture of the ship *Benova*, built for the Commonwealth Government of Australia. This is a sample of the advertisement. Four sister motor ships of the *Benova* are nearing completion. They were not engaged in building our ships and had to go out and get these outside orders.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Who is the author of the article from which the gentleman has been reading?

Mr. EDMONDS. I was reading from the New York Post, first Australian number, published in New York, September 27, 1919.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I do not like the general statement emphasizing the fact that not a wooden ship was built on time. In the only wooden-ship yard in my district, at Cornwallis, all the ships were built on time; in fact, they were delivered before the dates specified in the contracts. I think it is fair to make this statement in view of what the gentleman publishes.

Mr. EDMONDS. That may be true.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. The writer said the wooden boats were not delivered on time.

Mr. EDMONDS. That may be true in regard to the ships being built for the Emergency Fleet Corporation. Of course, the yard in the gentleman's district was not building ships for the Australian Government.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. That statement said that all the wooden ships that were built in our country were not built on time.

Mr. EDMONDS. I am quoting Mr. Boynton, a member of Parliament of Australia.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. He alluded to ships in our country also?

Mr. EDMONDS. He alluded to ships that were built on account of the Australian Government in our country.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. For Australia?

Mr. EDMONDS. For Australia. I am very sorry, indeed, to see this article in the paper. It seems to me if we expect to get a large trade in shipbuilding in this country our shipbuilders ought to take care of this matter. They can do it, and there is no reason why we should be subject to this criticism in far-off Australia.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman's remarks are very interesting. Will he indulge me to say that I recently saw a statement in Lloyd's comparing the actual cost of production of ships in this country with those in Great Britain. Following the whole proposition to its last analysis, taking up the identical essentials necessary to the production of a vessel, and the rough estimate of the increased cost in the United States was somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 per cent, that it actually cost in this country to-day for labor and material 20 per cent more to produce a ship than it does in Great Britain.

Mr. EDMONDS. Of course, I am not an expert shipbuilder, and I hesitate to express any opinion on that subject. But I would like to say to the gentleman that it is my impression that, considering the fact that we can get cheaper steel than the British Government can, we ought to be able to fairly well compete in the building of ships of the same style and character.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back seven minutes. The gentleman from Michigan has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, as I came in the Hall I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] make certain observations relative to the Naval Academy and heard him reading an extract from a paper, stating that two of the cadets had attempted suicide. After reading the article, Mr. KELLY commented on hazing at the academy, and his remarks created in my mind the impression that he thought hazing was responsible for the two midshipmen attempting suicide.

It was my pleasure last summer to be a member of the congressional board that visited Annapolis during the commencement, and I met the officers in charge and the civilian faculty, and I never met anywhere a finer body of men. I also had the privilege of meeting a great many of the midshipmen. They were happy and proud to be midshipmen, and in my opinion they are as fine a class of boys as you will find anywhere. My only child is a midshipman, having been appointed by Senator HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, and I know from him, as well as from the officers, that no hazing of an injurious character at all is permitted at the academy. Under an act of Congress hazing is absolutely prohibited, and the superintendent and officers endeavor to enforce the law. Now, of course, the boys have little rules and regulations; one of them, for instance, being that members of the fourth class can not walk down a certain walk, that they can not cut corners, and that they can not go out of certain doors. The plebes are treated just like freshmen at any college are treated by upper classmen; but there is nothing done there that would reflect on the honor or character of a boy or in anywise injuriously affect him.

Now, in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON] that a lot of midshipmen fall out because they could not keep up, that is absolutely the fact. They are not resigning or leaving because they do not like the academy, as Mr. KELLY intimated, but because of failure to

meet the requirements to remain. Pardon me for referring to a matter personal with me, but I mention it because I know the facts. My son has just finished his first year and is now a youngster. When he entered last year there were 995 boys in his class. That class in one year is brought down to 770. If a boy in any one month fails to make 2.5 in any study—4 being the maximum mark of grading—unless the academic board especially permits him to remain in the academy, he is dropped out.

Now, I know nothing in the world about the cases of these two young men, but I do feel this, that if the character of hazing they get over there caused them to attempt to commit suicide these boys did not have grit and stamina enough to make good naval officers. I know Admiral Scales, the superintendent of the academy, and his faculty have not the slightest objection to any investigation being made of their acts and doings, and I know them well enough to know that they would court such an investigation as proposed by Mr. KELLY. As I stated, I am not authorized to speak for them, but after the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] I felt, in justice to the academy and to the faculty, that I should make these few scattering remarks. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I visited Annapolis two years ago, and asked one of the officers what percentage of the midshipmen were graduated. I am not positive, but I think he said two-thirds were dropped during the four years because they were not able to pass the examinations. That may be too large a percentage, but I know I was surprised that such a large percentage failed.

Mr. CRISP. I will say to the gentleman that a great number of them drop out. I can not say what the percentage is. I do happen to know that last year's class, which is now the third class, when it entered had 995 members, and in the last report I received from the board as to my son's work the class had fallen to 770 members.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I recall from the newspaper account, there was no indication that the attempt of these young men to commit suicide was superinduced by the action of the superintendent or anyone else in the academy.

Mr. CRISP. Admiral Scales stated, according to the paper, that hazing had nothing whatever to do with the attempt of these two young men to commit suicide.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Michigan, and I thank him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back four minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], or such time as he may desire to use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the subject that we have been discussing just now causes to rise in my mind a query of considerable importance as to why it is that so many of the cadets in both the academies fail to make the final examinations. We are certainly making constant improvement in our facilities of education. There never has been a time when we have spent so much money in order to supply the equipment, and there never has been a time when we have required a higher grade of training for teachers than to-day. In the selection of my candidates for the two academies I have always left it to competitive examination, in order that I might get the best trained, so that there would be no failure in the examination. I have not succeeded. The last two appointees that I recommended upon that sort of examination failed. No; I should not say the last two. The last one failed, and the preceding one dropped out for a reason that I want to explain. And, to be honest with you, that is why I asked for the five minutes, for I have no complaint upon the importance of a high standard of scholarship for the academies. In the onset I wish to say that, as a schoolman myself, I fully realize the advantage, if not the necessity, of rigid discipline, and therefore I would be the last man on the floor of this House to question the wisdom of the rigid discipline which is being exercised at these academies. If I could say so without being regarded as hypercritical, I would without hesitation declare that some of the rulings, especially at West Point, are without good sense. I say that as one knowing the need of discipline in higher education.

A recent appointee of mine at West Point was notified by his father, and the day after that notification he was notified by the officers of the hospital, that his mother was lying at the point of death, and he was asked to come home. He made his ap-

plication for leave to go home to the authorities of the academy. He laid the matter in telegrams before them. He was told that if he should go home he would have to resign. The boy had the choice of resignation or remaining and disrespecting the call of father and also the call of the officer of the hospital in Cincinnati. He did exactly what you would have done and what I would have done. He resigned and went to his mother. She died.

He came to talk to me about this immediately upon the death of his mother, which occurred in about 10 days, and I felt so outraged over the fact that I took it up immediately with the superintendent, and asked him if it were not possible to reinstate the boy so that he could go right on with his work without losing the year. The officer who wrote me declined to do it. He said he would lose the year, and that if he wanted to enter again he would have to reenter anew, although they would not require him to take another examination for entry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FESS. I wrote to the superintendent and said that I appreciated fully, as I thought, the necessity of rigid regulations, and I certainly appreciated the interruption of a few days in the middle of the year in a course of higher education such as was being given in the institution; but I thought that under the circumstances this boy ought not to be compelled to lose a year, and I should insist that his statement regarding the break of but two or three weeks was not sufficient to deny his reentrance and being placed where he was when he was compelled to resign. I had a letter in answer which was extremely curt, giving me to understand that that was their regulation, and that I could accept it if I wanted to or not, but that the boy would not be reinstated, and if he wanted to reenter he would have to come in under the regulation which put him off to the end of the year. The boy, of course, did not go, as I, nor you, would not have gone.

Now, I speak as a friend of the academies. I wish that distinctly understood. I have not had any sympathy with a good deal of criticism that has been offered against them. But I think this is a case that is simply outrageous, and I feel quite keenly about the matter. Whether there is an explanation that is rational or not, I confess it was not rational to me as a schoolman.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. ALMON. The gentleman is no doubt familiar with this educational institution and its regulations. I was wondering what control Congress has over its regulations pertaining to matters such as the gentleman has referred to, if any.

Mr. FESS. I think Congress has given the academy almost carte blanche authority to make their own regulations as to courses of study and discipline, and I am rather of opinion that we will have to do that; that we can not here, from the floor, direct the regulations of the academy. We should have men of sound common sense in whom we can safely confide. But what shall we say of men who will make regulations such as operated upon this young man and then curtly reply to a man who demands that that injury be remedied without working an injustice to the person who is totally without fault? I do not think there is a Member in this House who would criticize the young man, or who would have said that boy should have remained in the academy, because he was called to resign or be absent from the mother when she was on her deathbed. It seems to me that it was not only a perfect outrage, but a case of inhuman brutality that must not be allowed to become the rule in any Government institution.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. CRISP. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman in that case, and I rise to ask if there are any rules or regulations forbidding the granting of leave by the superintendent in such cases?

Mr. FESS. No. That is wholly within the discretion of the superintendent, as it ought to be.

Mr. CRISP. That is, in his judgment?

Mr. FESS. Yes; and it was his judgment or the judgment of the officer acting that if you granted the leave it would so interrupt the work that the boy could not fit in again when he came back, and therefore he refused to allow him the leave of absence.

Mr. CRISP. He could have granted the leave?

Mr. FESS. Most certainly. No authority save his own will would prevent granting the leave of absence.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I would state to the gentleman from Ohio that I had a splendid young man from Sierra Blanca, Tex., now in the district of the gentleman from El Paso [Mr. HUDSPETH], who stood the preliminary examination, and of 27 boys, high-school graduates, in that district he stood the highest examination in the competitive contest, but on the final examination he failed only in algebra, and in that only by a very small margin.

Later on I was given to understand that there would be another examination that year, and at my suggestion the young man came to Washington and entered a preparatory school—Dowd's Academy. His parents are not rich, and this was done at great sacrifice on the boy's part and on the part of his parents. After he entered Dowd's Academy the commandant at Annapolis ruled that the young man would have to wait until the next year to take the examination; that he could not take the one coming the next month, because he would not be allowed to take two examinations in the same year. I thought that was a very harsh ruling to make under the circumstances, for the young man would be over age the next year, and he was thus prevented from entering Annapolis after going to quite an expense in making preparation.

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend from Texas along that line that I have had no disposition to find fault with the authorities on a matter of the rigidity of examinations, or upon the matter of their rigidity in discipline in keeping up their ranking. What I draw the line on is a case like that of the illness of a cadet's mother, where the rules, within the discretion of the officers, would not allow that boy to go to the deathbed of his mother without resigning and losing his opportunity. I think that is little short of criminal. When I called the attention of the officer to it by letter I received a curt reply, evidently written by some understrapper.

I am no better, and we on this floor are no better, than people outside. Our position here entitles us to no consideration further than to perform our public duty, and I do not ask for any reply as a Congressman that I would not ask as a citizen at home in private life; but it was evidently some understrapper, who felt his authority, who gave me to understand that no amount of experience that I had had as a college officer for 25 years would equip me to say that they were in the wrong. That is why I did not like it. The reply was couched in language usually employed by an irresponsible who was exercising temporary authority and who evidently wanted it known that he was giving final orders. I know no way to reach such cases of boorishness, but, to say the least, Congress should exercise superior or commanding authority when such palpable and brutal injustice is permitted in a Government institution whose life depends upon the will of this body. We have a great academy at West Point as at Annapolis, but such conduct sheds no credit upon them and should not be tolerated a moment longer than it can be corrected.

Mr. HUDSPETH. The gentleman has stated that he did not think Congress had anything to do with the making of these rules; but we could pass a resolution of condemnation of such an act as that, could we not?

Mr. FESS. I think so; and, if necessary to prevent its occurrence, I should vote for it.

Mr. HUDSPETH. I think it ought to be done.

Mr. WALTERS. Will the gentleman state his experience as an educator, as to the possibility of a student regaining the ground that he might have lost during his brief absence from the academy?

Mr. FESS. Why, certainly. A student of any rank who was absent for two or three weeks in a college year could with ease, as my friend, our colleague, Mr. FAIRFIELD, who is an experienced educator, will admit, catch up with his class and get back in his rank, whether it be in mathematics, languages, or what not. It has been done every year and in every standard college in America. It was simply, in my judgment, a chimerical indiscretion on the part of some understrapper, who assumed to tell me that this boy, in order to go home to the deathbed of his mother, would have to resign and lose not only the year but his opportunity to be in the academy. For I fully agreed with him when he related to me at my home the details, after having written me about that matter, that I would not fault him in the least for deciding not to return. I have called attention to this incident because of what was just said by other Members about the academies, not as a critic, but as a friend of these institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Michigan has one minute remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, unless further time is desired, I will ask for the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read section 1.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a member of the committee a question.

There has been a good deal of comment in the papers in regard to the disposition of two of the great ocean grayhounds—the *Imperator* and the *Vaterland*, the last named of which did such splendid service under the American flag as a transport. Some of the newspaper accounts state that the *Imperator*, which was never in the hands of the Allies and always at anchor at Cuxhaven, is now to be allotted to the American Government and that we are also going to retain the *Vaterland*. I have been unable to substantiate these rumors or to find out the truth of the matter, and I would like very much to ask some of these gentlemen of the Merchant Marine Committee what is the status of these two great ships. I specify no one to whom I would direct my remarks.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will ask the gentleman if he has inquired of the Shipping Board?

Mr. HICKS. I have, and they do not seem to know.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If they do not know, I am sure nobody else does.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I supposed they were under the direction of the Shipping Board.

Mr. SCOTT. If I can be considered as within the category of the gentleman's inquiry—

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman is eminently qualified.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman. I recently saw in a newspaper a statement that the *Imperator* and the *Vaterland* had both been assigned to the United States.

I have never seen any contradiction, although previously it was said that the *Imperator* had been assigned to Great Britain. This last statement, which purported to outline the facts, said that the *Imperator* had been taken over by the Fleet Corporation and they had refused to turn her over to the British Government.

Mr. HICKS. That is all the information I have seen on the same line, but it does not really give us anything definite, because newspaper accounts are many times imaginative articles.

Mr. SCOTT. The disposition of these ships has no particular bearing on this bill now before the committee.

Mr. HICKS. I am fully aware, Mr. Chairman, that my question does not refer to the bill, but I am operating under a poetic license and striking the ball outside of the strict location of the diamond.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not criticizing the gentleman's inquiry; I was only saying that we are not changing the names of these ships.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I would like to know through what agency the ships were apportioned to Great Britain. Is there any reason why Great Britain should claim the right to allot the ships?

Mr. HICKS. That was a mystery to me, what claim Great Britain could have to the *Imperator*. She was never under the British flag.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman will permit me to reply to the gentleman from Indiana, after the war was over a general commission was appointed and allotment was made. It was determined that the United States was entitled to all enemy ships that were interned in the United States at the time of the war. That rule prevailed as to the other allies. At the close of the war the enemy ships that were not in the possession of the Allies during the war became the subject of controversy as to their disposition. I think the peace conference decided that their disposition should be brought about by a commission appointed, and these ships were allotted pro rata to the Allies in proportion to their respective losses by submarine attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the privilege of securing such changes of name the following fees shall be paid by the owners of vessels to collectors of customs, to be deposited in the Treasury of such collectors as navigation fees: For vessels 99 gross tons and under, \$10; for vessels 100 gross tons and up to and including 499 gross tons, \$25; for vessels 500 gross tons and up to and including 999 gross tons, \$50; for vessels 1,000 gross tons and up to and including 4,999 gross tons, \$75; for vessels 5,000 tons and over, \$100.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, in line 11 the word "of" ought to be "by." I move to strike out the word "of" and insert the word "by."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "Treasury," strike out the word "of" and insert the word "by."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. WALSH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ROGERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3620) to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels, and directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SCOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a bill which I have overlooked and I would like to call up and have read. It is on the Private Calendar, H. R. 6857.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] to say that the bill to which he refers is on the Private Calendar?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. My understanding of the rule is that bills on the Private Calendar can not be called up on Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct. Bills on the Private Calendar can not be called up on Calendar Wednesday.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, October 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. GOOD, from the Select-Committee on Budget, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9783) to provide a national budget system and an independent audit of Government accounts, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 362), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8433) granting a pension to Odelon Valcour; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9433) granting a pension to William L. Meister; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 9802) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to White Plains, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 9803) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Audenried, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 9804) to create a department of aeronautics, defining the powers and duties of the director thereof, providing for the organization, disposition, and administration of a United States air reserve force, and providing for the development of civil and commercial aviation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9805) donating a captured German 77 and carriage to the city of Fredonia, Kans., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 9806) to enable the Capital Traction Co. to acquire the stock, franchises, and property of certain street railway corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9807) to amend the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEARS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Resolution (H. Res. 325) to increase the salary of one special employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 326) directing the Secretary of the Navy to report on conditions in the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 327) for the consideration of H. R. 4438; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 9808) granting a pension to Mildred S. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 9809) granting a pension to James D. Brown, alias James D. Kester; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9810) granting a pension to Sam Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9811) for the relief of Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 9812) for the relief of Janie Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 9813) granting a pension to F. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9814) granting a pension to James M. Waide, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Hulda Flatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9816) granting an increase of pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) granting a pension to John E. Root; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, protesting against the military intervention of the United States in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Thomas Enright Post, No. 97, Veterans of Foreign Wars, on the subject of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of California Peach Growers (Inc.), urging the placing of an effective tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of sundry citizens of Gnadalouspe County (Saguin), in opposition to the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Lithuanians of Amsterdam, N. Y., asking the United States Government to recognize their independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Montgomery County, N. Y., protesting against certain provisions contained in Senate

bill 2906, known as the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Elizabeth Powell Bond and 46 other residents of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., urging congressional investigation of lynching and mob murder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the return of the American soldiers from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, protesting against military intervention in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, protesting against universal compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Women's Post War Council, favoring the return of the bodies of the dead soldiers of our forces when possible; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of members of the clerical forces of the naval establishments, favoring an immediate increase in salaries; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the American Legion, indorsing and approving the action and purpose of the congressional investigating committee to place responsibility for the alleged unnecessary wrongs inflicted against officers and soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of Capitol Petroleum Co., against propaganda interfering with independent oil companies in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Memorial of Highland Park Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolution of the Minnesota Joint Engineering Board, urging Congress to provide for the utilization of the water power at the Government dam at Minneapolis, without longer deferring action in anticipation of general water-power legislation; to the Committee on Water Power.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 9, 1919.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our present help in every hour of need, we turn to Thee this morning, thanking Thee for opportunity and for all the privileges of life, and ask Thy guidance in meeting the confusions and unrest of these times. Help these Thy servants in every circumstance of responsibility. Grant Thy grace, we beseech of Thee, in the sick room at the White House, and to Thy servant the President reveal Thyself as a helper and healer. Accept of us and glorify Thyself in and through the Nation. Through Christ our God. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	McCumber	Simmons
Ball	Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Harding	Myers	Spencer
Brandegee	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Caldwell	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Newberry	Thomas
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Nugent	Trammell
Culberson	Kendrick	Overman	Underwood
Cummins	Kenyon	Owen	Wadsworth
Dial	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	King	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kirby	Phelan	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Poinsett	Williams
Fernald	La Follette	Pomeroy	Wolcott
Fletcher	Lenroot	Robinson	
France	Lodge	Sheppard	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	

Mr. NEWBERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], who are engaged in a committee hearing.